RESTORATION QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

A Study of Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66})—Frank Pack 1

Textual Authority for John 7:53-8:11—Fausto Salvoni 11

Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (II)
—Abraham J. Malherbe 16

Some Notes on Swearing—J. W. Roberts 30

The English Puritan Struggle and the Question of Biblical
Authority—Earl Irvin West 35

Book Reviews—Pat Harrell, Editor 49

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

WOLFBOOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

VOL. 4. NO. 1. FIRST QUARTER, 1960

V.4-5
1960-61
108294

Published by *Restoration Quarterly*

Issued Quarterly

EDITOR

J. W. Roberts, Abilene Christian College
Box 173, Station ACC; Abilene, Texas

EDITORIAL BOARD

Batsell Barrett Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
William M. Green, University of California, Berkeley 4, California
Reuel Lemmons, Editor *Firm Foundation*, Box 77, Austin, Texas
Joe Sanders, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
J. D. Thomas, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Jack P. Lewis, Harding College, School of Bible and Religion, Memphis, Tennessee
Everett Ferguson, N.I.C.E., Villanova, Pa.
Joe White, George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Pat Harrell, P. O. Box 431
Villanova, Pa.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Abe Malherbe, Box 144,
Lexington, Massachusetts

Contributions are invited. Manuscripts and communications for the *Quarterly* should be addressed to the editor. MSS should be typewritten, double-spaced, and proof-read before submitted. Notes and appropriate references may either be at the end of the articles or at the bottom of pages. Hebrew and Greek words should be transliterated. A biographical sketch should accompany each new contributor's work. No manuscripts will be returned, except when accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Books for review should be sent to *Restoration Quarterly*, P. O. Box 431, Villanova, Pa.

Subscriptions and business correspondence should be sent to the Business Manager, P. O. Box 431, Villanova, Pa.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular
One Year $4.00

Students
One Year $3.00

Single Copies $1.25

Entered as second class mail at Villanova, Pennsylvania.

A Study of Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66})

Frank Pack

Some notice has been taken previously in the *Restoration Quarterly* of the discovery and publication of the new papyrus manuscript of the Fourth Gospel, bearing the name Papyrus Bodmer II and the Number P^{66} in the manuscript catalogues, but no extended study of this most interesting textual treasure has been attempted. Because of its antiquity and the light shed upon important New Testament textual problems, this manuscript find becomes particularly important. While the John Rylands Library fragment containing portions of the eighteenth chapter of John is of great interest in dating the Fourth Gospel, it contributes very little to the study of the text of the gospel because of its fragmentary nature. The same must be said of the Chester Beatty Papyrus (P^{45}) which in the Fourth Gospel contains only materials from chapters 10:7 to 11:57, thus omitting many of the most important passages textually in the book. Scholars have been dependent upon the great uncial manuscripts for textual study of this gospel until the publication of Papyrus Bodmer II.

The papyrus bears the name Bodmer II because it is a part of the Bodmer Library of World Literature at Geneva, Switzerland. The circumstances of its discovery are shrouded in mystery, so that no details are available at the present time. It has been published in two parts under the editorship of Professor Victor Martin, professor of classical philology at the University of Geneva and president of the International Association of Papyrologists. The first part of the manuscript was published in 1956 covering John 1:1-14:26, except for two missing leaves containing chapters 6:11-35. Fortunately other fragments of this same manuscript have been published in the second part in 1958, containing portions of all the remaining chapters of the Fourth Gospel. However, in the last chapters only the tops of the pages were preserved. The last bit of text preserved is John 21:8, 9.

Brief Description of the Manuscript

While Martin conjectured that the entire manuscript contained 146 pages in his publication of the first part, it actually contained 154 pages, as the second part has shown. It is now clear that the original manuscript contained only the Fourth Gospel. P^{66} is a codex made up of simple quires, probably never bound with boards, since there is no evidence of glue on the sheets. However, it may have had a supple binding sewed loosely to its exterior. Its pages are rather small, measuring 16.2 x 14.2 centimeters, or about 6″ x 5½″. Some scholars have pointed out the fact that the book may have been made this small because it could be easily hidden during times of persecution, which were common at the time of its copying. It was evidently written by a professional scribe in a formal literary

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL

hand that is dated around 200 A.D., thus making it one of the earliest manuscripts of an entire book of the New Testament that we have. Developed punctuation is lacking. A dot placed slightly above the level of writing is the usual method of punctuation. About ten times a colon is placed at the end of a section and the rest of that line is left blank. In a few instances the first letter of the next section is written one space to the left of the normal margin line, which is the reverse of our present practice of paragraph indention.[1] One odd usage is the employment of an apostrophe after a proper name. In common with other Biblical manuscripts of this period, the four *nomina sacra*, God, Jesus, Lord, Christ, are always abbreviated, as well as certain other words often abbreviated: man, Father, Spirit, and Son.[2]

While the margins are wide, considerable variations exist concerning the number of lines to the page, and apparently more erratic use of space characterized the scribe as he proceeded toward the close of the manuscript which accounts for the unavoidable error Martin made in his original estimate of the number of pages the manuscript had. While a number of mistakes were made in copying, so carefully have these been corrected that only a few remain uncorrected.[3] Forty-seven mistakes were corrected by scraping the codex, which is a practice unknown in papyri codices. One hundred and ninety-two times a letter or word has been inserted above the line, eleven times a change of word order has been indicated by a sign of inversion and longer omissions have been marked with a special sign and the corrections placed in the margins.[4] So this system of corrections indicates careful handling by the scribe possibly or the corrector.

Professor Martin used Souter's Greek Testament as his basis of comparison with P^{66}, a fact which has brought him criticism from textual critics. While competent in the study of papyri, he blundered in selecting a Greek text which set forth the textual evidence for the English Revised Version, but does not show the many variations in other manuscripts where the King James Version and the English Revised Version do not differ. A cursory examination of Souter's Testament and Nestle's latest edition will point out this fact. Where Souter does not give a variant reading in a passage, Martin has assumed that the manuscripts agree here, and if P^{66} differs from Souter he has assumed that it presents a "new" reading.[5] However, this is not true necessarily as Professor Kurt Aland has shown. He worked out a new collation of P^{66} reducing the number of "new" readings from 380 to 78, with the possibility that

---

[1]Filson, Floyd V., "A New Papyrus Manuscript of the Gospel of John," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXII, No. 2, May, 1959, p. 59.
[2]*Loc. cit.*
[3]Collins, John J., "Papyrus Bodmer II," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XX, No. 3, July, 1958, p. 282.
[4]*Loc. cit.*
[5]Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

some of these will be eliminated as more information is gained from other manuscripts.[6] While scholars have criticized this part of his study from a methodological angle, it has been universally recognized by the scholarly world that he has done an excellent job in editing and publishing this interesting addition to our knowledge of the Biblical text. Moreover, one of the problems in textual criticism has been settling upon a basic text for collation purposes that can be universally used and which will thus give a comparable picture of textual variation in any manuscript collated against it.

Its Textual Character

In the preliminary studies that have been done on its textual relationships the evidence indicates that no great revolution will be produced in our understanding of the NT text through its readings. It confirms the antiquity of the Alexandrian text tradition, allying itself often with B and Aleph. Klijn points out that P^{66} and P^{45} are not dependent upon one another textually, although there are several places where they unite in their evidence against other text-types. Klijn thinks that P^{45} is more Western in its reading than P^{66}, which he places closer to the B Aleph tradition. P^{66} evidences less readings of the Caesarean type than does P^{45}, so that Klijn concludes that P^{66}, while being a mixed text is not as mixed textually as P^{45}.[7] It will be pointed out in this study that in several readings P^{66} allies itself with Western witnesses, whose influence is seen in the Textus Receptus, thus pointing out that there are readings which are old and well-attested in the Textus Receptus, and which cannot be discounted merely because they are found in later witnesses, for they are also evident in early witnesses. In fact, both P^{45} and P^{66} have shown that there are prevalent in Egypt around 200-250 A.D. both Western text-types and "neutral" or Alexandrian text-types, existing side by side. Klijn thinks that the original text from which P^{66} was copied was Western in type, but the corrections are commonly in agreement with the Alexandrian text-type as exemplified by B and Aleph. Other scholars have held that the original was Alexandrian with corrections bringing the copy more closely to correspond to Sinaiticus in its final form. With more careful collation against a text that will bring out a larger number of variations, and with more detailed studies of the textual phenomena of the manuscript as well as its relationships to other text-types these early judgments can be either confirmed or altered.

P^{66} and Textual Displacement

One of the interesting confirmations which P^{66} affords the traditional text of the Fourth Gospel is that it follows the traditional order of chapters and verses as we have them in our Bibles, apparently throughout the entire manuscript. This is obviously true for

---

[6]Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

[7]Klijn, A. F. J., "Papyrus Bodmer II (John 1-14) and the Text of Egypt," *New Testament Studies,* III (1957), pp. 329ff.

the early and fuller part of the document, which makes it most likely that the latter part in its entirety was in order. It has been one of the peculiarities of modern scholarship in its study of the Fourth Gospel to insist that the materials in our present gospel have suffered a number of displacements so that the book appears to us today as disorganized and disjointed. James Moffatt in his translation of the New Testament introduced elaborate schemes of rearrangement of the chapters and verses in the Fourth Gospel. His influence can be seen in the work of J. H. Bernard, William Temple, and G. H. C. Macgregor. He suggested the following changes in the textual order:

(1) 3:22-30 should be removed to follow 2:12. "This change also improves the itinerary, since Jesus, in Galilee in 2:1-12, is next brought *eis ten Ioudaian gen* (3:22) before going up to Jerusalem at 2:13."[8]

(2) 7:15-24 should be transposed to follow at the close of chapter 5. Then follows chapter 6 entire, and 7:1-14, 25-52.

(3) 10:19-29 should be transposed to the close of chapter 9 for the sake of sequence, followed by 10:1-18, 30-42.

(4) Chapter 11 he rearranged extensively: verses 1, 2, 5, 3, 4, 6-17, 20-30, 18, 19, 31-57.

(5) Chapter 12 he rearranged by placing verses 44-50 immediately after the first half of verse 36, and followed verse 50 with 36b-43.

(6) Chapters 15 and 16 should be inserted after 13:1-31a, followed by 13:31b-38 and chapter 14.

(7) Chapter 18 should be rearranged as follows: verses 1-14, 19-24, 15-18, 25-40.[9]

Others have also wanted to insert chapter 6 between chapter 4 and chapter 5 and to rearrange chapter 18 as follows: verses 1-13, 24, 14, 15, 19-23, 16-18, 25-40.[11] One of the striking features of all theories of displacement as applied to the Gospel of John is their disagreements among themselves regarding what should be re-positioned in the book. In addition, no manuscript evidence exists for such elaborate rearranging of the text. Only in connection with chapter 18:13-24 does the Sinaitic Syriac version endeavor to meet some problems through rearrangement. It should be pointed out that P^{66} as the earliest manuscript of the major portion of the Fourth Gospel available to modern scholarship follows the traditional order of chapters and verses, without any hint of such radical rearrangements of text as proposed above. If such rearrangements were made after the production of the autograph, they should be evident in

---

[8]Barrett, C. K., *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S. P. C.K., 1956), p. 18.

[9]Moffatt, James, *A New Translation of the Bible*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper's, 1935), *ad. loc.*

[10]Macgregor, G. H. C., *The Gospel of John* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), pp. 329-332.

[11]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

some form in later manuscripts, at least in the earliest copies that are possessed. However, the very absence of these rearrangements should make any such argument strongly suspect. If the author himself was responsible for the rearrangements in the text as "corrected" into its present form, some powerful reason must be assigned for such work on his part that would make him change the "original" material and place it in the present arrangement. P^{66} is a very strong argument for the traditional order of the text, and it deals a powerful blow to the theories of rearrangement which have been so popular in this century among certain circles. Such theories may make some problems easier of solution, but their weakness lies in the fact that there is no basis in textual study for their existence, and that they propose a solution to problems that is too easy.

Some Interesting Readings of P66

Perhaps in no other way can the textual character of a manuscript be ascertained than through noticing its readings, in particular those that attract attention through their uniqueness to the document, or that show interesting textual relationships to other text-types. P^{66} contains some very interesting readings which will be noted in this part of the article by chapter and verse locations consecutively through the gospel.

1:18. Here P^{66} contains the very interesting reading *monogenes theos*, "only begotten God," along with Aleph B.C. 33 sy pesh hl. mg. bo Gnostics C1 Orig, while *ho monogenes huios*, "the only begotten Son," is read by A W Theta fam 1 fam 13 lat sy cur sa Tert Eus Chr and by the Textus Receptus. Thus another early witness is given to *monogenes theos* despite the fact that the ASV and the RSV continue to follow the second reading. *Monogenes theos* must be the original reading for which the more usual reading, *ho monogenes huios*, occurring with some frequency elsewhere in this gospel was easily substituted. Hort pointed out years ago that "the converse substitution is inexplicable by any ordinary motive likely to affect transcribers."[12] Both readings are intrinsically good, and apparently no doctrinal controversy stirred around the passage to point up a controversial interest in the readings.

1:24. *apestalmenoi* is read without the plural definite article *hoi* by P^{66} along with Aleph A B sy pesh co against the insertion of *hoi* by W Theta fam 1 fam 13 vg and Textus Receptus. The shorter reading has the better attestation. Barrett states, "It gives a slightly different sense: those who were sent, not the senders, are said to belong to the Pharisaic party."[13] He thinks the insertion may have been an "improvement" made to smoothe the difficulty felt in saying that the Pharisees were the senders when the Sadducees were more influential as priests, and would "correct" a lack

[12]Hort, F. J. A., *The New Testament in Original Greek, Introduction* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1881), p. 74.
[13]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

of information on the part of the writer, but this evaluation of the motivation for the conscious insertion seems highly subjective, and entirely lacking evidence.

1:28. P^{66} reads *Bethania* with Aleph* A B W Theta 28 157 it vg against *Bethabara* with *Psi Pi* fam 1 33 (fam 13) sy cur (sin) sa Orig Eus and Textus Receptus. Origen mentions the reading *Bethania* in "almost all the manuscripts" (*Commentary on John*, VI, 40) but points out that in travels through the area he could not locate the site of Bethany beyond Jordan, but did find that of Bethabara, a name found in the Old Syriac versions and found by him in some copies. These he regarded as "more accurate" and Chrysostom follows his judgment in this regard. *Bethabara* evidently represents a geographical correction given prominence through Origen's scholarship. *Betharaba* must be a variant through metathesis. Undoubtedly *Bethania* is the original reading and P^{66} adds another confirmatory voice to the chorus of evidence.

1:51. *ap' arti* is omitted before *opsesthe* with Aleph B W lat co while this phrase is inserted before the verb to read "hereafter ye shall see . . ." with A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl sy pesh hl and Textus Receptus. In this reading our papyrus manuscript confirms the reading rendered in the ASV and RSV.

2:15. P^{66} inserts *hos* before *phragellion* along with W L fam 1 33 124 565 it vg sy h. mg. a reading which Barrett states is "perhaps correctly" given.[14] However, the standard English versions follow the omission of *hos* in their renderings.

3:13. P^{66} joins the Alexandrian tradition again in rejection of the insertion *ho on en to(i) ourano (i)*, "who is in heaven," after *anthropou* at the close of this verse. Aleph B W L 33 pc Orig also reject the clause. The insertion is given by A Theta fam 1 fam 13 579 pm vg sy cur and Textus Receptus while the addition *ho on ek tou ouranou*, "who is from heaven" is found in 0141 80 88 syr sin. This offers a good opportunity to show the difficulty at times of properly interpreting textual variation. Hort was certain in his "Notes on Select Readings" that the addition of the clause "who is in heaven" was placed there to clear up misunderstanding arising out of the position of *anabebeken* before *katabas* and he called this a Western-type gloss, which would certainly have been gladly used by later writers if it had occurred in their texts before Chrysostom's time.[15] Barrett, however, interprets the evidence in the opposite manner, holding that the omission of the clause "solved" a difficulty involving the Lord who was speaking on earth, but that John had originally written the clause as appearing in many manuscripts and in the Textus Receptus.[16] P^{66} bears witness, it would appear to this writer, to the fact that such an omission of an original portion

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 165.
[15]Hort, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 76.
[16]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

of the gospel, if this is what it is, must have occurred very early. It would seem rather that the insertion was an attempt to affirm about our Lord what ch. 1:18 suggests ("who is in the bosom of the Father"), with the clause existing in several forms. Yet on such a point it is hard to be dogmatic, for the evidence can be interpreted in more than one way. Having some general knowledge of the high level of reliability of the Alexandrian tradition, the confirming evidence of P^{66} makes the insertion suspect to this writer.

3:25. *Ioudaion* is read with Aleph* Theta G fam 1 fam 13 al lat sy cur bo sa Orig and Textus Receptus against *Ioudaiou* Aleph^c A B W 28 pm sy pesh hl. Both variants have excellent authority, and it is interesting that in this case P^{66} is found aligned against B W and certain others in reading "Jews." It seems that contextual probability must decide the more likely reading in this case. Constantly throughout this gospel "the Jews" have been the opponents of Jesus and John the Baptist. It would appear that the word *tinos* would have occurred if the singular had been in the original. Of course, in fairness it should be said that the plural *ton* also might be expected with *Ioudaion.* It appears to this writer, however, that the usage throughout the gospel with the added weight of P^{66} and Aleph in the original hand tips the scales in favor of the plural, and with the Textus Receptus at this point. Textual scholars are coming to realize that the Textus Receptus may hold a number of authentic readings and especially when there is additional evidence coming from more ancient text-types than the Byzantine types. The extreme weight given to B in particular needs to be modified in the light of newer discoveries.

4:9. In this verse there is an explanatory gloss, certainly not a part of the speech of the Samaritan woman, but placed here either by the evangelist, or as an interpolation into the text by some scribe. P^{66} is our earliest witness to this explanatory statement followed by A B W Theta fam 1 fam 13 it vg sy sa bo and Textus Receptus, while it is omitted by Aleph* D a b e j. If this is an explanatory gloss interpolated into the text by a scribe, it must have been done at an extremely early period. While this is a possibility it would appear more likely in view of other explanatory statements occurring in the gospel for the benefit of Gentile readers that it was made by the evangelist to explain the coldness and belligerence of the Samaritan woman to Jesus' simple request.

4:34. P^{66} reads *poieso* with B D W Theta fam 1 and Westcott-Hort against *poio* with Aleph A fam 13 28 700 al and Textus Receptus. The differences in tense of the subjunctive in the *hina* clause may indicate something of the changes that have in a minor way affected the text in transmission where the variation is so slight that it cannot be represented in translation into English. Does *poio* represent an early effort to emphasize the work of Jesus as continuous through use of the present subjunctive? Is this a slight stylistic change to bring the statement more completely into harmony

with erudite conceptions of grammar, such as characterized many minor stylistic changes? Questions like this cannot be answered definitely. Obviously the better attested reading in which both Western and Alexandrian witnesses agree is that found also in P^{66}.

5:1. *heorte,* "feast," occurs here without the article along with A B D W Theta fam 1 fam 13 sy cur and Textus Receptus against the reading, *he heorte,* "the feast," in Aleph C L Delta fam 1 33 sa bo. The confluence of a number of Alexandrian witnesses plus Western witnesses including the Curetonian Syriac and P^{66} make the argument in favor of anarthrous *heorte* a very strong one. The insertion of the article seems to be an attempt at defining the chronology on the part of some scribe, since this is the only place the word *heorte* occurs in the Fourth Gospel without the article. This attempt has perpetuated itself in a certain group of manuscripts belonging to the Alexandrian text-type. Lambda attempts to identify the feast by reading *ton azumon,* "of unleavened bread," instead of the expression *ton Iaudaion,* "of the Jews." Another attempt is made in 131 which reads *he skenopegia,* "the feast of Tabernacles." It should be pointed out that if the article be regarded as genuine, the statement "the feast" would refer to the Feast of Tabernacles, for this was the common usage among Jews in the New Testament period.[17] Josephus points out that the Feast of Tabernacles was the most important Jewish feast of the year.[18]

5:2. Two variants occur in this verse of interest to the student of P^{66}. This papyrus reads *epi te(i) probatike(i) kolumbethra* with B W fam 1 fam 13 565 c f and Textus Receptus against *en te(i) probatike(i) kolumbethra* in A D Theta it. *probatike kolumbethra* without the article and preposition is the reading in Aleph* e vg (Sixtine and Clementine) and Eusebius representing a stylistic change often found in certain Alexandrian documents, while the phrase *epi te(i) probatike(i)* is omitted entirely and *kolumbethra* regarded as a nominative in 1 sy cur pesh and Iren (Latin). Barrett states that it is impossible to decide between the first two readings, and the difference between them hardly affects the translation at all.[19] It would appear that the first reading has the better textual evidence for itself, which is also the reading of P^{66}.

A number of variants have arisen over the name of the pool.

a. Bethesda—A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pm f q sy cur pesh hl mg.
b. Bethzatha—Aleph L 33 e 1
c. Belzetha—D a b ffl
d. Bethsaida—P^{66} B W pc c ff2 z vg sa bo Tertullian

---

[17]Howard, W. F., "The Gospel According to St. John: Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible,* Vol. 8 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), p. 539.

[18]See note in Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), *skenopegia,* p. 762.

[19]Barrett, *op. cit* , p. 210.

Amid such a combination of variants it is hard to know which is correct. A good case can be made out for each of them, although *Belzetha* may be a variation of *Bethzatha* in spelling. If so, these two together would offer a strong combination of evidence. It would appear from looking at the textual evidence that either b or d has better evidence than a, particularly if we regard c as a variant of b. In this place as in a number of others that we have noted P^{66} aligns itself with B and W and the Coptic versions in its reading.

5:3a. P^{66} joins in ending this sentence with the word *xeron*, "withered," with Aleph A* B C* 157 q sy cur sa and Textus Receptus while D a b j l r^1 z add *paralutikon*, "paralytics," to the list of plural genitives of description in this passage. Hort points out that this addition was not, however, perpetuated in the later tradition and thus is absent from the Textus Receptus.[20] Barrett observes here that this addition is "a good example of the Western text's inability to know when to stop."[21]

5:3b-4. P^{66} joins Aleph B C* 33 sy cur sa in omitting the entire passage. While some manuscripts add 3b, verse 4 is omitted by D W 157 f l q vg (Wordsworth and White) bo in addition to the above manuscripts, and the passage is marked with an obelus in other manuscripts as questionable. The verses are found in A L Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl it vg (Sixtine and Clementine) sy pesh and Tertullian along with the Textus Receptus. Hort points out that Chrysostom was the first church father to show knowledge of this interpolation, for this is undoubtedly what it is, based possibly upon ancient tradition. The very fact that the passage appears in various manuscripts in a number of variant forms raises an additional argument against its authenticity. Origen's *Commentary on John* is defective at this point, and cannot help us in tracing its history. It is Hort's conjecture that 3b represents an early addition as an explanatory gloss in the light of verse 7 in the late Alexandrian tradition, and verse 4 was added later in explanation of the stirring of the water. Both additions became embodied in the Byzantine text, and Textus Receptus, and thus in our King James Version.[22] These verses are translated in the margin of the Revised Standard Version as follows, "waiting for the moving of the water; for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and troubled the water: whoever stepped in first after the troubling of the water was healed of whatever disease he had."

5:16. P^{66} aligns itself once more with Aleph B D W fam 1 69 565 at it vg sy cur sin sa bo in rejecting the addition *kai exetoun auton apokteinai*, "and they sought to kill him," inserted after *Iesoun*, "Jesus." The addition is found in A Theta fam 13 28 pm e f q r^1 and Textus Receptus, and also in the King James Version at this

[20]Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
[21]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
[22]Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

point. The overwhelming evidence of Alexandrian and Western authorities plus the early versions make the reading of P^{66} in this place undoubtedly the original one, and the addition a gloss brought back from later references to attempts to kill Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.

From these notes on interesting variants in P^{66} through the first five chapters one can see the wealth of material this document possesses. The survey of other readings in the remaining chapters of the Fourth Gospel will be given in a second article in the next issue.

Volume One - Number One, Reprinted

For several months those ordering back copies of the *Restoration Quarterly* have been unable to secure the first number of the journal. We are happy to announce that this first issue has been reprinted through the generosity of a friend and that it is available once more. The price is $1.00. Order at once so as not to be disappointed. This also makes it possible to supply the entire first three volumes to those desiring back issues. The first two volumes sell for $3.00 each and Vol. 3 for $4.00. Not too many sets are available and there is no plan to reprint when the sets now on hand are exhausted. Now is the time to secure a complete set of the *Restoration Quarterly* if you do not have all the back numbers.

Textual Authority for John 7:53-8:11

Fausto Salvoni

I read the study of Earle McMillan with great interest and agree with his conclusion asserting the interpolation of the passage in the present text of John.[1] I think it is possible, however, to add some suggestions in order to complete the preceding study from recent discoveries and other points of view neglected by the author.

I. The passage was not originally existing in John

It is of interest to know that the recent discovery of two manuscripts, Greek and Syriac, give evidence to the supposition of McMillan, that John 7:53-8:11 (as well as John 5:3b-4: the statement regarding the angel moving the water) is critically suspect. This passage does not exist also in these two manuscripts, recently discovered and not remembered by Earle McMillan, notwithstanding the great value of their antiquity. They are:

a) *Papyrus Bodmer II* (now assigned number Pap. 66) existent in the Bodmer Library in Cologny (Switzerland). The papyrus appears to date from about A.D. 200. Its first part (John 1-14) was published by Victor Martin, professor of classical philology at the University of Geneva.[2]

b) *Papyrus Bodmer III*, which contains the Gospel of John, as well as the opening chapters of Genesis, in the Bohairic dialect. This codex, which seems to date in the fourth century, comprises 52 pages, each measuring about 23.25 c.m. in height by about 16.5 in width.[3]

The textual tradition of the manuscripts is confirmed by the intrinsic study of the style. The comparison between the passage of the adulterous woman and the Gospel of John discloses two different styles not likely to be used by the same man. If anyone wants to maintain still that this passage is from John, he ought to suppose, as Belser did, that the present text is a compilation by another man, made with material coming from John.[4] I will show some of these

---

[1]"Textual Authority for John 7:53-8:11" in *Restoration Quarterly* 3 (1959) 18-22.

[2]Victor Martin (ed., "Papyrus Bodmer II, Evangile de Jean, chap. 1-14," Cologny-Geneva, Bibliotheque Bodmer, 1956. See also the articles of M. E. Boismard, "Le Papyrus Bodmer II," in *Revue Biblique* 74 (1957) pp. 363-398 (especially for the subject p. 364) and of F. V. Filson, "A New Papyrus Manuscript of the Gospel of John," in *Biblical Archaeologist* 20 (1957) 54-63.

[3]Rodolphe Kasser (ed.), "Papyrus Bodmer III, Evangile de Jean et Genese I-IV, " 2 en Bohairique (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Coptici*, Tom. 25 & 26, vol. 177 (the text) and vol. 178 (French translation). Louvain 1958. See also Bruce M. Metzger, "Recent developments in the Study of the Text of the Bible," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959) 13-20 (especially for the subject pp. 14-15).

[4]J. Belser, *Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes, uebersetzt und erklart*, Feiburg-im Briesgau 1905.

stylistical reasons in the following pages of my study.

II. The antiquity of the passage

The story of the adulteress is very old. At the close of III century it was existing in the Latin text used by Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. Jerome read it in many Greek manuscripts (PL 33, 553) showing, by his statement, that many others did not include the passage. Augustine, without reasonable argument, referred the suppression of this story in many manuscripts to the "suspicious mind" of the husbands.[5]

At any rate the passage was already known in A.D. 130. "Papias . . . refers also an episode of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord; this story is existing in the *Gospel of Hebrews*," wrote Eusebius in his *History Of The Church*.[6] Some claim that this *Gospel of Hebrews* is our Matthew.

It is however impossible from the preceding statement, to argue that the passage in question was written first by the apostle Matthew in his original Aramaic Gospel. We claim, indeed, as most of the scholars teach, that the Gospel of the Hebrews is not the original Gospel of Matthew, but only a remodeling of the first canonical Gospel made at the end of the first century[7] or, better, an independent Jewish-Christian tradition parallel to Matthew and Luke.[8] The difference existing between the fragments of this apocryphal gospel and the canonical Matthew oblige us to refute the identification of the two, notwithstanding the positive statement of Jerome (dead A.D. 420) and, among the recent scholars, of Theodor Zahn.[9]

We cannot compare the story of the adulteress related in the Gospel of John with that one existing in the Gospel of Hebrews, because no fragment of this apocryphal narrative is extant.

III. The possible origin of John's passage

It is possible that the story of the adulteress, now preserved in the Gospel of John, was written by Luke. For this supposition we

---

[5]*De adulterinis conjugiis*, II, Vvii, 6 (PL 40, 474).

[6]*Eusebe, Hist. Ecc.* III 39, 17. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis and a disciple of John, wrote in A.D. 130 a *Commentary to the sentences* (logia) *of the Lord.*

[7]A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den Judenchristliche Evangelien* (*Texte u. Untersuchungen* 37,1), Leipzig, 1911.

[8]B. Handmann, *Das Hebraer-evangelium. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik und Geschichte des Hebr. Matth.* (*Texte u. Unters.* 5,3), Leipzig 1888.

[9]*Th. Zahn, Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, Erlangen 1932, t. II, 686-704. The distinction is already admitted also by Eusebius, who, after having quoted the sentence of Papias: "Matthew collected the sentences (logia) of Jesus in Hebrew (or better in Aramaic), and everyone translated them as he could" (*Hist. Eccl.* III, 39,16), adds the statement that the story of the adulteress, known by Papias, is existing in a book called "Gospel of the Hebrew" but not "Logia of Jesus."

can adduce some important arguments, which imply a great degree of probability. They are: (a) *The general plan of Luke's Gospel.* It is well known that Luke had a great liking for women. Many stories, existing only in the third gospel, concern women: the resurrection of the son of the widow of Nain (7:11-17), the women who followed Jesus (8:1-3), and the sinner woman to whom Jesus forgave sins (7:36-50). Also the story of the adulterous woman, whom Jesus gave forgiveness, is more in harmony with the plan of Luke's gospel than with other gospels. On the contrary, it does not harmonize with the plan of John's gospel, because always there a miracle gives the opportunity of many following discussions with the Jews of a theological teaching.

b) The style of this story is more in harmony with Luke than with John.[10] The following are some of the philological arguments which can be multiplied by other scholars.

v. 1. *Oros ton elaion* ("mount of Olives"). This construction exists only in Mark (3 times), Matthew (2 times), and Luke (4 times), but never in John.

v. 2. *paregeneto* (aor. of *paraginomai*). This word is to be found only 1 time in John (3:23), 3 in Matthew, and 1 in Mark. On the contrary it is very frequent in Luke (27 ? times). See Luke 7:4:20; 8:19; 11:6; 12:51; 14:21; 19:16; 22:52; Acts 5:21; 9:26-39; 10:32, 33; 11:23; 13:14; 14:27; 17:10; 18:27; 20:18; 21:18; 23:16, 35; 24:17,24; 25:7; 28:21. *Paraginomai,* followed by *eis* with the accusative of place, is existing only in John 8:2 and Acts 9:26.
pas ho laos is a peculiar usage of Luke (7:29; 8:47; 9:13; 18:43; 20:26, 45; 21:38). Outside the Gospel of Luke this construction appears only in Matthew 27:25. In John the word *laos* ("people") exists only in 11:50; 18:14; but with the signification of "the whole of the Jewish nation." For the meaning: "of assembled people," as in Luke, John uses the word *ochlos* (7:32, 40, 43; 11:42; 12:34; but never *pas ho laos.*

v. 3. *Stesantes auten en meso(i)* ("and placing her in the midst") this construction has parallel passages in Acts 17:22; 27:21. John, notwithstanding the absence of the movement, uses the accusative *este eis to meson* (John 20:19, 26).

v. 10. *katekrinen*: This verb, signifying "to condemn," is used by Matthew (12:41), Luke (11:31), Mark (14:64). John for the same meaning uses, on the contrary, the simple verb *krino,* as we see in 3:17; 5:22; 12:47, 48; 16:11.

v. 11. *apo tou nun* ("henceforward") is a construction used only by Luke (for instance 1:48; 5:10; 12:52; 22:18, 69). John uses,

---

[10]Compare P. Jouon, *L'evangile de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ,* edit. 2, Paris 1930 pp. 508-510.

in the same meaning, the words *ap' arti* (John 13:19; 14:7; compare also Matthew 23:29; 26:29, 64).

It is therefore necessary to argue that the style of this passage is more that of Luke than of John.

c) *The manuscript tradition.* An important family of manuscripts, called "family 13" or now, "Ferrar group," place the story of the adulterous woman after Luke 21:38.

This group consists of 13 manuscripts, written in the centuries X-XV. They came in a large part from south-Italy (Calabria) where they were imported in the seventh century by some Greek monks coming from Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. Probably they represent an older text existing in Syria.[11]

The text is not therefore so recent as had been supposed in the past and may offer some good readings of the original text. Is it not possible that this family of manuscripts preserved also in this case the original right place of the discussed passage now existing in John?

This is only a supposition. But this supposition gives us a better context for the story than the one of John. We can read the sequence of the verses: Luke 21:37 "And every day he was teaching in the temple, but at night he went out and lodged on the mount called Olives. 38 And early in the morning all the people came to him in the temple to hear him. (John 7:53) They went each to his own house, but Jesus went to the mount of Olives. Early in the morning he came again to the temple; all the people came to him, and he sat down and taught them. The scribes and the Pharisees brought a woman who had been caught in the act of adultery . . ." This supposition explains the Lukan style of this story and its harmony

---

[11]They are:
evan. 13 (Paris gr. 50) cent. XII-XIII.
ev. 69 (Leicester, Libr. of the Town Council 29) cent. XV.
ev. 124 (Vindob. Bibl. Palat. 188), cent. XII.
ev. 346 (S. 23 Sup. Ambrosiana, Malano %), cen. XI.
ev. 174 (Vat. gr. 2002) cent. XI.
ev. 230 (Madrid, Escirial III,5) cent. XI.
ev. 543 (Michigan, Ann Arbor 15) cent. XIII.
ev. 788 (Athens, Nat. Library 26) cent. X-XI.
ev. 826 (Grottaferrata, A, III) cent. XXII.
ev. 828 (Grottaferrata, A, V) cent. XII.
ev. 837 (Mitano, Ambrosiana S. 14, Sup.) cent. XIV.
ev. 983 (Mount Athos, Esphigm. 29) cent. XIII.
ev. 1689 (Serres, Podrom. 10) cent. X.
Six other manuscripts are connected with this family, but their relationship is not so close as the preceding manuscripts. Compare for this family: Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Goettingen 1906; Rendel Harris, *On the Origin of the Ferrar Group*, London 1893; Idem: *Further Researches into the History of the Ferrar Group*, London 1900; Streeter, *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins*, London 1927; F. Russo, I manoscritti del gruppo Ferrar, in *Rivista Biblica* (1956) 253-269.

with the plan of Luke's Gospel. The Ferrar group therefore preserved, possibly, the original place of the passage.

It is now impossible to explain why this passage was displaced from the gospel of Luke. But the following is likely: Maintained carefully by the church for its canonical origin, it was afterwards inserted in the Gospel of John. In John 8:15 Jesus said he would not condemn anyone. This sentence recalled to mind the last words of the story: "Neither do I condemn you" (John 8:11). The material connecting the present text of John. The asserted Lukan origin of John 7:53-8:11 is only a supposition, which however is not only possible, but, perhaps, probable.

ADDED FEATURES FOR THE QUARTERLY

With this issue some changes are being made in the make-up of the *Restoration Quarterly.*

First we are adding two men to our board. These men are Everett Ferguson, Dean of Northeastern Institute for Christian Education at Villanova, Pa., and Joe White of George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif. We believe that these men will be good additions to our present staff.

Pat Harrell will assume the editorship of the Book Review section. The entire responsibility of this part of the journal will be his. We urge all interested to cooperate with him in making this section of the journal the best ever.

The size of the *Quarterly* is being expanded. Ten pages are being added, all to be taken up by the Book Review section. This leaves the forty-eight pages which we have been having completely to articles. The fourth issue each year will continue to be a special issue of ninety-six pages.

The cover is being altered slightly to carry the table of contents.

Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (II)

Abraham J. Malherbe

In the first part of this survey attention was given to the introductory problems of sources, dating and methodology. This part will be devoted to placing early Christianity within this setting. The relationship between Gnosticism and the N. T. will first be considered, followed by some comments on Gnosticism and early Church History, and finally, by some remarks on the new discoveries of Nag Hammadi and their importance for the future study of Gnosticism.

Gnosticism and the N. T.

Since one cannot mention the N. T. these days without taking the Qumran community into consideration, we might as well pay homage to the efforts that have been made on the one hand, to associate them with, or on the other, to disassociate them from, Gnosticism, before we pass on to more relevant matters. Before surveying the contemporary discussion, it should be pointed out that J. B. Lightfoot, eighty years ago, thought that the Gnostic heretics of Colossae were Essenes.[1] This fact is not generally recognized.

It is surprising to some of us that there is something which is admittedly not to be found in the writings of Qumran, but it is the general conviction today that the Essenes were not Gnostics. As appears from the writings of present-day Gnosis hunters, the failure to find at least a few Gnostic ghosts, is not due to any lack of effort on their part.

H.-J. Schoeps' view was originally that there was no pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism at all. The Qumran discoveries were explosive enough to make him change his mind, however. He now thought that the appearance of the descent of the angels of Genesis 6 in this literature was enough to suspect Gnosticism.[2] However, this also appears in apocalyptic Judaism and in Philo.[3] More recently, though, Schoeps has returned from this little excursion, and is now more skeptical that these apocalyptists were Gnostics.[4]

Professor K. G. Kuhn of Heidelberg used to speak of "a Palestinian-Jewish pietistic sect of Gnostic structure,"[5] but later drew some important distinctions between Gnosticism and the beliefs of Qum-

---

[1]J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, London, 1876, pp. 73-113, *passim*.

[2]Cf. his article in *Zeitschrift fuer Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6(1954), p. 276ff.

[3]G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, p. 406, 483; II, p. 315; J. Drummond, *Philo Judaeus of the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy*, I, p. 338.

[4]Cf. his *Urgemeinde-Judenchristentum-Gnosis*, Tuebingen, 1956. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 38, note 2, says that Schoeps does this because his view of Gnosticism is too narrow.

[5]Cf. *Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche* 47(1950), p. 210.

ran.[6] Bo Reicke, Cullmann's colleague at Basel, has also warned against looking for an elaborate Gnosticism in the Scrolls.[7] The problem seems to be to determine which came first, the hen or the egg. R. McLean Wilson holds to the view that with Qumran, as with the N. T., it is a question of terminology that was later adopted by the Gnostics.[8] W. D. Davies has also lately indicated that this is how similarities are to be explained.[9]

The one really positive assertion that the Gnostics were there after all, comes from Schubert, who asserts that part of the *Man. of Discipline* (iii.13-iv,26) is the oldest extant Gnostic text.[10] This has been discounted, however.[11] Cullmann is also holding out for some Gnosticism in Qumran.[12] Although he denies Lidzbarski's and Bultmann's illegitimate use of the Mandaean literature, he still thinks that this literature illuminates early Christianity and its background. Cullmann apparently does not see that the real problem in making the Essenes Gnostic, is that there is no Redeemer myth in the Scrolls. This was exactly the feature of the Mandaean writings that Bultmann and Lidzbarski seized upon to interpret Christianity. Its absence in Qumran may very well be the reason why Bultmann and his epigonists have not evinced more interest in Qumran than they have!

Turning to the N. T. proper, we shall first consider the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, and then refer to a few favorite supposed examples of Gnosticism in Paul's letters.

Not much is said in the Synoptics of man's knowledge of God, except Matt. 11:27 (Luke 10:22), "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him." For Bultmann, there is a Gnostic ring to this statement, and it could therefore not have been spoken by Jesus.[13] This is a good example of how one can find Gnosticism if one looks for it hard enough. The statement by Jesus is intelligible within the framework of the O. T. expectation of the Messiah, and Jesus' claim to be that Messiah.[14]

---

[6]Cf. his "*Peirasmos-hamartia-sarx* im N. T. und die damit zusammenhaengenden Vorstellungen," *Zeitsch. f. Theol. und Kirche* 49 (1952), p. 200ff., 296ff.

[7]Cf. his "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *New Testament Studies* 1(1954-1955), p. 137ff.

[8]*The Gnostic Problem*, London, 1959, p. 74; Cf. also M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York, 1955, pp. 252-259.

[9]*Harvard Theological Review* 46(1953), p. 113ff.

[10]*Die Religion des nachbiblischen Judentums*, p. 85ff., and more fully in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 78(1953), cols. 495ff.

[11]Cf. *Vigiliae Christianae* 11(1957), p. 99ff.

[12]*Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 25, note 3, p. 38, note 2.

[13]*Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*, 2nd edition, 1931, p. 171f.

[14]Cf. Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1958, p. 43.

The situation is quite different with regard to the Gospel of John. It is pre-eminently a Gnostic book, according to the devotees. Reitzenstein first saw in the Hermetic writings a Gnosticism that was pre-Christian in origin.[15] With the publication of Lidzbarski's works on the Mandaeans,[16] he found a comrade in arms, and drew the Mandaeans into his pre-Christian *gnosis*. He was the first to make the close connection between the Mandaeans and John the Baptist, and to deduce from this supposed connection that Christianity arose from a sacramental religion with a Gnostic theology. Bultmann[17] then took over and developed the idea that the Gospel of John is a revision of the Mandaean Redeemer myth, which was supposed to have been a feature of the Baptist theology. C. H. Dodd, in his conversation with Bultmann does not attach too much value to this Mandaean view. He does think, however, that the elements which were responsible for the Hermetica, played a formulating part in the Fourth Gospel.[18]

Again one has to refer to the problem of sources, dating and methodology. This is perhaps more necessary in the case of the Mandaean theory than in that of Dodd. Too often Casey's evaluation of Reitzenstein also holds for other scholars with this interest, when he says of him, "In matters of chronology he was singularly cavalier and raised the subjective criticism of documents to a high imaginative art."[19]

Even a rapid reading of John will make clear why this gospel, and the Johannine writings in general, are such a happy hunting ground. Here are terms and concepts which became favorite with the Gnostics, e.g., the idea that the descending Son of God is himself Truth, the themes of Faith, Union with God, Light, Glory, Spirit, Logos. Then there is also the fact that the earliest Gnostics were the first commentators on the Fourth Gospel,[20] and that the earliest extant Gnostic material is closer to it in spirit than to any other N. T. book.

---

[15]*Poimandres*, p. 35, 248.

[16]M. Lizbarski, *Das Johannesbuch des Mandaeer*, Giessen, 1915; *Mandaeische Liturgien*, Berlin, 1920.

[17]Stated most succinctly in *Zeitsch. fuer Neust. Wissenschaft* 24 (1925), pp. 100-146, and more elaborated in his *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Goettingen, 1952. Bultmann has the support of W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Tuebingen, 1925. H. Leitzmann, "Ein Beitrag zur Mandaeerfrage," *Sitz.-Ber. Akad. Berlin*, 1930, p. 596ff., however, shattered this theory when he pointed out that the Mandaean baptismal liturgy was modeled after that of the Syrian Nestorians, and that the mentioning of John appears in the Mandaean writings for the first time in Arabian times. See also thus, C. F. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, p. 100ff., and in *Journal of Theol. Studies* 29 (1928), p. 228ff., 235ff.

[18]Cf. C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, esp. pp. 97-130.

[19]R. P. Casey, "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the N. T.," in *The Background of the N. T. and Its Eschatology*, edd. W. D. Davies and David Daube, Cambridge, 1956, p. 53.

[20]W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Giessen, 1928.

It is remarkable that one generation after John, these basic words of the Christian faith had assumed a totally new content. It should be noted, however, that John stands midway between the Synoptics and our earliest Gnostic sources, the Valentinians.[21] Significant is, not only the terminology that John does use, but also the forms that he does not use. For instance, it is striking that he uses the verbs *ginoskein*, "to know," and *pisteuein*, "to believe," as frequently as he does, but that he never uses the nouns, *gnosis, pistis, sophia.* It seems as if John is emphasizing that religious knowledge is something active. To believe is to obey (John 3:36). Faith and knowledge are not gifts imposed upon man without any responsibility being placed upon him. These were common Gnostic misunderstandings. These two factors of chronological position and the significant use of terminology enable us to place John correctly in the Gnostic milieu. John was evidently writing to a situation in which Gnosticism was beginning to flex its muscles. John purposefully develops the concepts that the Gnostics were beginning to appropriate, and thus indicates the differences. This view accounts for the similarities between John and the Gnostics, but it also recognizes the uniqueness and distinctiveness of John.

Paul is said to have interpreted the death of Christ in terms of a Gnostic myth.[22] There is much in Paul's teaching that would have appealed to Gnostics. These terms, without their correct or total content, could easily be included in their systems. Thus the contrast between flesh and spirit (Rom. 15:27; 2 Cor. 7:1), the conception of Christ as being victorious over "the world-rulers of this darkness" (Col. 2:15; Eph. 6:10ff.; 4:8ff.), or as the man from heaven (1 Cor. 15:47), his use of the terms *gnosis* and *pneuma*, could be and were assimilated by the Gnostics. Bultmann[23] says that Christianity "may employ Gnostic ideas and terminology" to describe the situation of natural man in the world. Whether these ideas were already Gnostic at the time of their use in the N. T., is precisely the question. The evidence that they were, is lacking.[24]

---

[21]Despite recent attempts to date the Gospel of John close to the middle of the first century, and to see Palestine as its provenience, the present writer still favors the late date, and Ephesus as the most likely place of origin. The evidence which has traditionally pointed to this has not been changed at all by the recent discoveries. For the early date, see W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John," in *The Background of the N. T. and Its Eschatology*, edd. Davies and Daube, pp. 153-171.

[22]Bultmann, *Theology of the N. T.*, I, p. 298.

[23]*Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting*, New York, 1956, p. 189. See A. D. Nock's review of the German edition of this work in *Nuntius* 5(1951), cols. 37-39.

[24]G. Quispel, *The Jung Codex*, London, 1955, p. 76ff.; Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, p. 71f. Dupont, *Gnosis: La Connaissance religieuse dans les Epitres de Saint Paul*, Louvain, 1949, criticizes the view that Paul was influenced by Hellenistic mysticism. He tries to prove that the Pauline conception of *gnosis* is quite in the tradition of the

If there were similarities and points of contact between Paul and the incipient Gnosticism, there were also great differences. It must have been very strange to Gnostics to read from Paul that Love abides, above all mysteries and knowledge (1 Cor. 13:12)[25], and when he urges consideration for those weaker in the faith (1 Cor. 8). A still deeper difference is evident from Paul's soteriology. Whereas to the Gnostics the Redeemer came primarily to bring the secrets of salvation to a favored few, Paul's thought is dominated throughout by the Cross, the message of which is meant for all.[26]

A few references to this kind of work in the area of Pauline studies will illustrate the problem. W. Schmithals[27] is generally regarded by the Bultmann school as having proved that Paul's opponents in Corinth were Gnostics. Some of these scholars are not satisfied that Schmithals' arguments for 2 Corinthians are as convincing as those are for 1 Corinthians. Schmithals is on the way to becoming *persona non grata* with them, for they think that he is bringing opprobrium on the whole Gnostic approach by some of his radical theses. He thinks, for instance, that the doctrinal error combated in Galatians is Gnostic, a theory exceeded in absurdity only by that of Kaesemann, who thinks that a Gnostic theology underlies Hebrews.[28] The radicalism of Schmithals is said to embarrass the whole school. What should be really embarrassing about Schmithals, however, is not that he is so much more radical, but that he is actually applying the same method to the study of Galatians that is applied to John, Paul and Hebrews. Recent attempts indicate the popularity of his views on 1 Corinthians. They attempt to prove that the references to "knowledge," wisdom," "the perfect," and "mystery" in 1 Cor. 1, 2 are all part of a Gnostic theology that Paul is combating with a somewhat Gnostic system of his own.[29] Characteristic of these attempts is the total disregard for the larger context of the Corinthian correspondence. In isolation, these so-called Gnostic terms can be made to mean anything, but in the total picture of 1 and 2 Corinthians it is clear that Paul is not addressing Gnostics, but simple Christians who were thinking of themselves and their understanding of Christianity more highly than they ought.

O. T. and Judaism. Cf. Bultmann's review of his book in *Journ. of Theol. Studies NS* 3(1952), p. 10ff.

[25]Cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, London, 1931, p. 127ff.

[26]Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[27]W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*, Goettingen, 1956.

[28]Cf. W. Schmithals, "Die Haeretiker in Galatien," *Zeitsch. fuer Neutest. Wissenschaft* 156, pp. 25-27. Ernst Kaesemann's *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, Goettingen, 1938, was recently reprinted without any recognition of any new work done in the intervening years, e.g., of W. Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1951, who presents a cogent and attractive argument.

[29]U. Wilckens, *Weisheit and Torheit, eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu I Kor. 1 und 2*, Diss. Heidelberg, 1956. His views are summarized in his polemic with Schlier, as "Kreuz und Torheit," in *Kerygma und Dogma* 3(1957), pp. 77-108.

Ephesians and Colossians, because of their soteriology and cosmology, are suspect.[30] For reasons of brevity, our comments will be confined to Ephesians, and particularly to the picture of the *hieros gamos*, the holy marriage, between Christ and the church, of chapter 5, in the light of Gnostic thought. The picture of Christ as the bridegroom and the church as the bride is very common in later Gnostic material. It is claimed that the theme of a heavenly union appears quite frequently in Jewish material, and that this influenced Paul. How generally some connection between Paul and this kind of thought is found, is evident from the fact that even a man like Schlier, who argues against Pauline dependence on Gnosticism, emphasizes the commonness of the concept, and states that it is not a question of interdependence between Paul and Gnostics, but a question of common background.[31] If the statements of Paul in Eph. 5: 22 and 2 Cor. 11:1-6 are taken in isolation, one may come to such a conclusion. However, placed in their context, there is a world of difference. The parallels to Philo[32] and *Wisdom of Solomon*[33] are really no parallels at all. Paul's use is in no way speculative, but has a very practical purpose. The attempt to find a parallel in Graeco-Roman religion can only be of academic interest, since no connection with Christianity has been demonstrated.[34] The closest parallels are to be found in the Apostolic Fathers,[35] and even here it is clear how they differ from Paul. It is precisely this kind of speculation that led to Gnosticism. The Apostolic Fathers show a stage

---

[30]For an exhaustive discussion of the problems of these two letters, see Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund, 1946. After a close investigation into the theology and language of the epistles, Percy decides in favor of the Pauline authorship.

[31]H. Schlier, *Die Brief an die Epheser*, Duesseldorf, 1958, pp. 264-276. Schlier's attitude toward Gnosticism has been undergoing a change paralleling his own religious development. He is a recent convert to the Catholic Church, after having been a leading liberal N. T. scholar for years. This gradual shift is particularly discernible in his writings on Ephesians: *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief*, 1930; with W. Warnach, *Die Kirche im Epheserbrief*, 1949, and his latest commentary on Ephesians. His religious odyssey is traced in a collection of his articles written during the last thirty years, in *Die Zeit der Kirche*, Freiburg, 1958. Schlier's method needs to be carefully evaluated, even though he is probably the best equipped apologist of the orthodox view, for he still betrays a reluctance to discount many of his previous conclusions. Furthermore, he also shares a psychological affinity with Gnosticism; cf. his sympathetic treatment, "Das Denken der fruehchristlichen Gnosis," in *Neutestamentlichen Studien fuer Rudolf Bultmann*, hgg. von W. Eltester, Berlin, 1954.

[32]E.g. *De Abr.* 99ff.; *Cher.* 40ff., 49; *Somn.* I, 200; II, 185.

[33]E.g. *Wisd.* 9:4; 10:1ff (cf. 10:4); 8:3f.

[34]Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, p. 262f.

[35]E.g. *II Clem.* 14; *Hermas Sim.* 5, 6, 5ff. For Gnosticizing expressions in Ignatius, see Schlier, *Zeitsch. fuer Neutest. Wissensch.* Beiheft (1929).

in the development in this direction. It is much more reasonable to think that Paul remembered Jesus' use of the bridegroom,[36] and that he applied Jesus' emphasis on the indissolubility of marriage (Matt. 5:32; 19:4ff.) to the relationship between Christ and the church. It is clear from 1 Cor. 7:10, 12, 25 that Paul was conscious of Jesus' teaching when he himself spoke of marriage. The literary evidence does not therefore support the Gnostic theory. Neither does the content, nor the Pauline precedent in discussing marriage.

An attitude quite as tendentious as this has also been present in the study of Philippians, and especially in that of the *kenosis* passage, Phil. 2:5-11. Lohmeyer[37] discovered that this was a pre-Pauline Palestinian hymn, probably used in the Lord's Supper. It is remarkable that, despite the fact that it is the *locus classicus* of Pauline Christology in Philippians, it is hardly used in the early church before Clement of Alexandria. It should be pointed out that this section appears in Paul in a very practical context. Friedrich Loofs[38] thought that the "mythological," or speculative view was a departure from tradition, and arose in Gnostic circles. Taking his cue from Loofs, and from the scarcity of the passage in the second century, Barnikol[39] decided that Marcion, or at least the Marcionite circle, were responsible for the present form of the passage. According to this theory, they completely reworked the basic Philippian text, and added vss. 6 and 7. When one arranges the Christological statement of Phil. 2:5-11 next to Tertullian's description[40] of Marcion's Christology, the similarity is indeed noticeable, and it is clear that this was one of Marcion's main proof texts for his Christology. To ascribe to him or his school the role of author or redactor, however, is to go beyond the evidence. Such treatment of the passage will have to be more evident from our sources before Barnikol's theory will be generally accepted. The absence of Phil. 2:5-11 can more naturally be explained as due to the hesitancy of Christian writers to circulate a passage which ostensibly supported an heretical view, without discussing it in great detail. After Marcion had been faced by able apologists, the passage does appear without comments as to its possible use by Marcion.[41]

---

[36]Matt. 22:1ff.; 25:1ff.; Mark 2:18ff. (Matt. 9:14-17; Luke 5:33-35), John 3:29.

[37]E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2:5-11, Sitz.-Ber. Akad. Heidelberg.*, 1927-1928; more briefly stated in his commentary in the Meyer series, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, Goettingen, 1953.

[38]F. Loofs, *Das altkirchliche Zeugnis gegen die herrschende Auffassung der Kenosisstelle*, 1927, p. 102.

[39]E. Barnikol, *Der marcionitische Ursprung des Mythos-Satzes Phil. 2:6-7*, Kiel, 1932.

[40]*Adv. Marcionem* V, 20.

[41]By Irenaeus: Eusebius, *H.E.* V,22; *Adv. Haer.* I,10,1; III,12,9; IV,24,2; V,16,3. Clement of Alexandria: *Cohort. ad Gent.* I,9,5-7; *Paedag.* I,237,5f.; *Strom.* II, 100,26-28; *Exc. ex Theodoto* 19,35,43. It is interesting to note that the passages in Irenaeus appear either

The theory is still popular with some that this is a Jewish-Gnostic hymn, adapted by Paul to express his own Christology, in terms which would be understood,[42] and by others, that the Hellenistic *Urmensch* Redeemer myth is really the basis.[43] Bultmann, emphasizing the confession of verse 11, also considers the passage to have come from the pre-Pauline Gnostic stock.[44] The error of the Gnostic view is at least twofold. First, the assumption itself that the pericope is Gnostic. The only thing that is actually agreed upon, is that it is Gnostic, but when one observes the different kinds of Gnostic dualism that are posited, confidence in Gnosticism wanes. On the one hand, there is Jewish ethical dualism, and on the other, Greek metaphysical dualism, while even Marcion's own homegrown kind is not slighted. If agreement cannot be reached on something as basic as dualism, one wonders how the assurance can be so great that this is Gnostic. Secondly, the context in which the hymn appears, is quite strange for Gnosticism. The hymn is quoted with an ethical motivation. It is quoted with an exhortation to humility, which is not quite a Gnostic ideal![45] In the absence of any striking dualism, the Gnostic view is dependent upon a soteriological meaning of the hymn, which is also not present. In the absence, then, of any definite dualism, or of the soteriological sense required by Gnosticism, it is not at all clear how the *kenosis* passage can be regarded as Gnostic.

Gnosticism and the Early Church

For the larger context of this part of the problem, the usual handbooks should be consulted.[46] The three most important heresiarchs only will be treated here.

Simon Magus

Simon, who is first met in Acts 8, was considered by the early

---

in the practical sense, or are flanked by statements expressing his own well worked out *recapitulatio* theory. There would therefore be no danger of interpreting the passage mythologically. Clement, with his usual disregard for our clearly drawn modern line between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, is the first to use the passage in a heavily Christological manner.

[42]P. Bonnard, *L'Epitre de S. Paul aux Pilippiens*, 1950, p. 49.

[43]E. Kaesemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2:5-11," *Zeitsch. fuer Theol. und Kirche* 47(1950), p. 313ff.

[44]*Theology of the N. T.*, I, p. 175.

[45]Note the practical, ethical motivations with which the greatest Christological statements in the N. T. are made: e.g. 2 Cor. 8:9; 1 Peter 2.

[46]Old, but still very useful, are W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei ep. Lugdunensis libros quinque adversus haereses*, Cambridge, 1875; Chas. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford, 1886; Harnack's works on Christian dogma and early Christian literature, although they are written from his untenable point of view on Gnosticism. An excellent work for obtaining the right perspective is the Bampton Lectures of 1954 by H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, London, 1954.

church to have been the first Gnostic heretic.[47] Quasten[48] thinks that he represents a pre-Christian *gnosis*, while Robert Grant believes that his Gnosticism is the oldest Christian Gnosticism, and that his importance lies in this fact.[49] He believes that its spread can be traced from Samaria, via Tyre and Antioch, to Rome, through the activities of Menander and Saturnilus, students of Simon. The importance of Simon for this survey lies not so much in what has been written on him directly in recent years, but in what we can or should expect. The Dead Sea Scrolls offer one direction. According to the Pseudo-Clementines, Dositheus was Simon's teacher. Now an attempt is made to find a connection between the Scrolls and Gnosticism through Simon and Dositheus.[50]

Another direction from which we might expect something new is the recent interest in the Samaritan Mission in the N. T.,[51] and the new realization of the similarity between the Samaritan theology and that of the Hellenists, who initiated the Samaritan Mission.[52] A possible point of connection between the Hellenists and the Samaritans which has not been made in this discussion, involves, among other things, the use of the term *ho huios tou anthropou*, "the Son of Man." It has been pointed out elsewhere that Acts 7:56 is the only place where this title is used by anyone but Jesus in the N. T.[53] Here Stephen refers to Jesus as the Son of Man in his speech which is our main source for comparing the Hellenists with the Samaritans. "Son of Man" is equally scarce in early Christian literature. The earliest occurrence in the second century is in Hegesippus' description of the death of James.[54] Here Hegesippus places in James' mouth the same title in a context similar to that of Stephen's death. James addresses his persecutors, "Why do you ask me concerning Jesus the Son of Man? He himself is sitting in heaven on the right hand of the great power . . ." Now it should be remembered that Hegesippus was a Samaritan, and really the author of the words ascribed to James.[55] Besides the common Samaritan background of Hegesippus and Acts 6-8, and the strange use of "Son of Man," there is also the use by both of the enigmatic "great power" (cf. Acts

---

[47]Cf. R. P. Casey, "Simon Magus," in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V, edd. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, London, 1933, p. 151ff. The main sources for Simon are: Justin, *Apol.* I, 26 and 56; *Dial.* 120; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I, 23-27.

[48]J. Quasten, *Patrology*, I, Utrecht-Brussels, 1950, p. 255.

[49]Robert M. Grant, "The Earliest Christian Gnosticism," *Church History* 22(1953), pp. 81-97.

[50]Cf. *Zeitsch. fuer Religion und Geistesgeschichte* 9(1957), p. 21ff.

[51]O. Cullmann, *Peter*, New York, 1958, p. 35ff.; "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission," *The Early Church*, Philadelphia, 1956, pp. 185-192.

[52]Marcel Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists*, London, 1956.

[53]Cf. Malherbe, "Christology in Luke-Acts (2)," *Restoration Quarterly* 2(1958), p. 121ff.

[54]Eusebius, *H. E.* II,23,12f.

[55]Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 194.

8:10), a term which was later considered to be Gnostic. Furthermore, Simon is considered a Gnostic, and James makes a Gnostic statement in Hegesippus' account, "tell us, who is the door of Jesus" (Eus. *H.E.* II,23,12).[56] This comparison should be worked out in greater detail, for it points to the possibility that already in the first missionary activity of the church, contact was made with ideas which developed into the Gnosticism of the Pseudo-Clementines, in which James and Simon play prominent parts.[57] Justin Martyr, also a Samaritan, and a man whose evidence is thus to be valued highly, should also throw light on the matter in his description of Simon and the Ebionites.

Marcion

Marcion was the arch heretic to Christians in the second and third centuries, as the number of writings against him attest. The early Christians thought of him as a Gnostic.[58] Marcion differed from the other Gnostics in that, while they were syncretistic, he evolved a "spurious Christianity by a kind of centrifugal process, that eliminated not only every heathen and Jewish element, but every Christian doctrine and tradition that clashed with his notions of the truths that every revelation from the good God ought to teach."[59] Marcion also differed from them in his dualism. His preoccupation with the problem of evil was the force which pushed him on.[60] His dualism therefore took on the strange form of a good God and a bad God. Marcion's docetic Christology is strange, compared to that of other Gnostics, for, whereas to them the suffering of Christ was the problem, for Marcion the incarnation was. He therefore lets Jesus appear in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, without having any childhood.[61]

Harnack made a life-long, sympathetic study of Marcion.[62] Because of his peculiar dualism and his Christology, Harnack did not think that Marcion should be classified with the heretical Gnostics.

---

[56]Cf. Bultmann, *Zeitsch. fuer Neutest. Wissensch.* 24(1925), p. 134f. for the idea that *thura*, "door" was already a pre-Christian Gnostic term with which the Redeemer was compared, and was taken over by Christianity. That the term became Gnostic, is agreed; that it was Gnostic before the N. T. period is not certain.

[57]Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, p. 381ff., traces the description of James' death (*Recog.* I, 70) to an Ebionite *Acts*, which was supposed to have been composed in reaction to the canonical *Acts*. See Cullmann's *Le Probleme Litteraire et Historique du Roman Pseudo-Clementin*, Paris, 1930, for the position of the Pseudo-Clementines in the larger context of the early church.

[58]Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* II,31,1; Tert. *Adv. Marc.*

[59]Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. cxlvii.

[60]Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* I,2.

[61]E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, London, 1948, p. 99ff.

[62]A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, Leipzig, 1921; 2nd edition, 1924.

Walter Bauer[63] then developed the theory that orthodoxy was really a development later than heresy. This took the edge off heresy, and tended to popularize Harnack's view of Marcion. John Knox supports this idea.[64] He also has the remarkable idea that Luke-Acts in its present form is probably a mid-second century product, and is, under one of its aspects, a defense against Marcionism. These authors have rendered a service by pointing out that the line between orthodoxy and heresy was not as clearly drawn as we might think. They have overstated their case, however, when they tried to make Marcion a second century Paul or Luther. After all, Marcion was ejected from the church, and long defenses were written against him. Happily, Marcionite studies have been placed in a better perspective by Blackman's recent study.[65]

Valentinus

Valentinus was in the church in Rome at the same time as Marcion. He had more followers than Marcion, but was not as good an organizer. He has been easier to study than any of the other Gnostics, because of his students' literary activities.[66] His students are usually divided into the Italic and Eastern schools. The main representatives of the former were Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, both of whom are considered to have been more orthodox than their master, while Theodotus represents the Eastern school. Because of the greater availability of sources of this school, great interest has been shown in the reconstruction of Valentinus' "system."[67] The most important of the recent Egyptian discoveries appears to have originated within the Valentinian circle. The following discussion of these finds will therefore further contribute to the understanding of Valentinus.

The New Discoveries of Nag Hammadi

In 1945, thirteen codices of a Sethian Gnostic library were discovered at Nag Hammadi (Chenoboskion) in Upper Egypt. One of the codices has been acquired by the Jung Institute in Zurich, and is known as the *Jung Codex*. There are altogether forty-eight works in the thirteen codices, the four most important ones being in the *Jung Codex*. The other twelve codices, which are in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, have not been made available, but an interna-

---

[63]W. Bauer, *Rechtglaeubigkeit und Ketzerei*, Tuebingen, 1934. Cf. H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, for an answer to Bauer. For the idea that the first Christian Church in the proper sense of the term was the Marcionite Church, see Barnikol's *Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions*, 1933.

[64]John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, Chicago, 1942.

[65]See note 60.

[66]See notes 7 to 14 in Part I of this survey.

[67]Cf. G. Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," *Vigiliae Christianae* 1(1947), pp. 43-73.

tional committee is now working to publish them.[68] Since the *Jung Codex* has been available longer, more is known about its contents than of any of the other books. It also promises to contain earlier and more important material than the others. Although found in a fourth century Gnostic Library, the *Jung Codex* contains material that is certainly second century Valentinian, and probably written by Valentinus and his students. It is also clear that Greek was the original language of these documents, which we now have in Coptic.

These writings, in the absence of an Edmund Wilson, may not be as well-known or as popular as the Dead Sea Scrolls, but they are just as important for the student of early Christianity. Some familiarity with the discoveries and their significance can be obtained from *The Jung Codex*, edited by F. L. Cross, London, 1955; and, more recently, Jean Doresse, *Les Livres Secrets des Gnostiques d'-Egypte*, Paris, 1958, an English translation of which has been promised for this year. The survey of the finds by R. McL. Wilson in the *Scottish Journal of Theology* 12(1959), pp. 161-170 is quite competent, being heavily dependent on the semi-popular presentation by W. C. van Unnik, *Openbaringen uit Egyptisch Zand*, den Haag, 1958. Nock's review of *The Jung Codex* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* 1958, considers the discoveries against the large backdrop of Gnosticism in general. Scholarly discussions in connection with the writings appear most frequently in *Vigiliae Christianae*, while German translations, the only available, except for *The Gospel of Truth*, appear from time to time in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

None of the new works can be discussed in detail here. Suffice it here to point out the importance of these discoveries for the areas of N. T., Church History, and the Contemporary Situation.

For N. T. studies, *The Gospel of Truth*, one of the works in the *Jung Codex*, is of greatest importance for the study of the canon. Written before 150 A.D., it already knew the four gospels, Paul's epistles, Hebrews and Revelation as a collection. For Textual Criticism, *The Gospel of Thomas* promises much, for Quispel has pointed to a number of agreements between it and Tatian's Diatessaron.[69] Furthermore, when it departs from the usual text, it agrees with Codex Beza. There are also more than one hundred agrapha in this Gospel. Some of them are obviously apocryphal, but some might very well be genuine sayings of Jesus. For the whole field of N. T. studies the discoveries should be of great benefit, for now much more is known of early Gnosticism. The whole discipline should benefit from a new evaluation of Bultmann's "demythologizing,"

---

[68]Two works from another codex, *The Gospel of Thomas*, and *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, have been published in the German translation. The *Apocryphon Johannis* also appears in this codex. Cf. note 14 in Part I of this survey.

[69]G. Quispel, "The Gospel of Thomas and the N. T.," *Vigiliae Christianae* 11(1957), pp. 189-207.

which underlies so much of the contemporary study, and which is built upon such an obviously shaky foundation.

For the Church Historian, these discoveries illustrate clearly the different phases of Gnosticism. Now we can also see what Gnosticism meant to a Gnostic. When all these works are published, we will know more about Gnosticism than the contemporaries of the Gnostics did. The question of the relationship between Gnosticism and Christianity, and Gnosticism and pagan philosophy will receive more attention, as the result of the finding of a copy of the *Asclepius*, part of the pagan Hermetica, in the library.

More light will be thrown on the very important Valentinus, for it seems that he wrote *The Gospel of Truth*.[70] Valentinus is important for clarifying our picture of what orthodoxy constituted in the early church. The question whether he was considered a Christian or not, now definitely has to be answered in the affirmative.[71]

The peculiar position of the Alexandrian church in the second century is an enigma, and the question of its status again arises. Nothing is told about the church in Alexandria in the N. T.,[72] and very little is known about it in the second century, except that the most well-known Christians there were Gnostics.[73] The earliest Christians about whom we have some definite information, namely Clement and Origen, were not exactly the epitomy of orthodoxy either, as far as Gnosticism was concerned. We have always known of Clement's use of Theodotus, of the Valentinian school, and of Origen's use of Heracleon's commentary on John.[74] Now, in the *Jung Codex* there is a writing tentatively called the *Treatise on the Three Natures*, which is ascribed to Heracleon. This writing is an anticipation of the speculations of the Church Fathers on the Trin-

---

[70]van Unnik, *The Jung Codex*, p. 104, thinks he wrote it about 140-145. Haenchen challenges this. One reason why he does, as do some other Germans, is because van Unnik emphasizes that it was written before the development of Gnostic dogmas. The German tendency is always to find Gnosticism early. If this mildly Gnostic writing was from Valentinus' early period, it provides a convenient *terminus a quo* for his development as a Gnostic. This development would take place too late for the Germans, who would much rather have Valentinus assume a system already developed. J. Leipoldt, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1957, col. 831, and Schenke, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1958, col. 497, note 1, also question its ascription to Valentinus. C. K. Barrett in *Exp. Times* 69(1958), p. 169, still accepts the Valentinian authorship.

[71]Thus Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, p. 27ff.

[72]Cf. however, Codex Beza on Acts 18:25, where it states that Apollos had learned about Christianity in Alexandria.

[73]Among those we know are, Basilides and his son Isidore (Iren., *Adv. Haer.* I,18,1); Carpocrates (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* III,2,5); Valentinus (Epiph., *Pan.* 31,2,3; 31,7,1); Julius Cassius (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III,13,91-95). Although Casey, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, p. 95 correctly says that we do not know where Theodotus lived, Clement's knowledge of him is suggestive of Alexandria.

[74]Cf. notes 8 and 10 of Part I of this survey.

ity, and in many respects is the precursor of Origen. Where Origen is different is in his insistence on man's freedom. The suggestion has been made,[75] which is worthy of investigation, that the main concern of Origen's theology of freedom was to attack the determinism of the Gnostics as contained in the *Treatise on the Three Natures.* Can it be said that this emphasis on man's responsibility, this "true Gnosis" of Clement and Origen, "is to be regarded as in a certain sense progressive Christianization of the 'Gnosis falsely so called' of the Valentinians"?[76] Bauer has said that we do not know much about the church in Alexandria because a later generation, who regarded the second century Alexandrian Christians as heretics, were ashamed of them, and threw a cloak of anonymity over them.[77] His statement may be too tendentious, but it does need to be reconsidered now that new and earlier sources for Alexandrian Christianity have been found.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that Gnosticism is not absent from the contemporary scene. On the one hand are the existentialists like Bultmann, Schlier and Jonas. Dodd has well said that in "the controvery with the Gnostics in the second century, the main point at issue was whether the Christian faith could be detached from its biblical and historical basis and preserved as a form of Hellenistic theosophy."[78] Wilson points out that "the same problem arises with every fresh attempt to present the Gospel in terms of 'modern thought'."[79] After the attempt, represented by the Germans von Harnack, Barnikol, Bauer, in the period between the two World Wars, was given up of making history conform to one's own world outlook, history was abandoned by the new school, and *Geschichte,* history viewed as God's saving acts, was substituted. This re-interpretation of history reveals a remarkable similarity to and empathy with Gnosticism.

Besides the existentialists there are the mystics like the Rosicrucians, and the dualists like the Christian Scientists. It is interesting that the first available codex is named after Jung, and that the expensive editions of *The Gospel of Truth* and Schmidt and Till's *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften* found a ready market, not so much among the penurious students of antiquity as among the more affluent psychiatrists and psychologists whose symbolic language has marked similarity to and affinity with that of Gnosticism. After reading Burkitt's psychological treatment of Valentinus' Gnosticism, and then *The Gospel of Truth,* upon the reading of Paul Tillich's recent works in which depth psychology is applied, one is brought to the realization that Gnosticism is not a thing of the past.

Lexington, Massachusetts.

---

[75]Quispel, *The Jung Codex,* p. 61.
[76]*Ibidem.*
[77]*Rechtglaeubigkeit und Ketzerei.*
[78]C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* London, 1952, p. 136f.
[79]*Scottish Journal of Theology* 12(1959), p. 163.

Exegetical Helps

Some Notes on Swearing

J. W. Roberts

The present article will continue the series in which attempt is made to explain some of the more definite points of grammar which give certainty to the English reader as to the meanings of passages in the New Testament. The articles are not written for the advanced student of the Greek New Testament and are not presented as representing original research.

This paper will deal with the grammar of certain passages in the Bible which are concerned with swearing or with the use of oaths and vows. The material bears on the absoluteness of the prohibition against swearing in the Scriptures and the morality of such oaths as civil testimony, oaths of office and allegiance, or marriage vows. The questions concerning these things bother many people.

Oaths in the Old Testament

We shall start with the proscriptions of the O. T. code. In Deut. 6:13 Moses said, "Thou shalt fear Jehovah thy God, and him shalt thou serve, and shall swear by his name." This language is repeated in substance in Deut. 10:20. The third commandment of the Decalogue did not prohibit oaths; it rather made sure that when one took an oath it was taken seriously and with an intention to keep it. It was against taking "God's name *in vain*" or lightly. To use God's name merely as conversation-filler, to swear with no intention of binding one's self, is to take God's name in vain. This is made more plain by the further stipulations against forswearing: "Ye shall not swear falsely by my name" (Lev. 19:12). "Whatsoever man shall vow a vow to the Lord, or swear an oath, or bind himself with an obligation upon his soul, he shall not break his word: all that shall come out of his mouth he shall do" (Num. 30:2).

The Grammatical Constructions. The O. T. uses a variety of constructions in expressing oaths and these may be studied to prepare for an understanding of the N. T. usage. The most common word for swearing in the Hebrew Bible is *saba'* ("I swear"). It is usually followed by the preposition "by" (*be*) of that by which one swears and "to" (*le*) to express the person to whom the oath is made. This verb is usually translated in the Greek Old Testament (The Septuagint) by the verb *omnumi* ("I swear"). This verb occurs some 173 times in the Septuagint. However the rendering of that by which the oath is taken varies greatly. The following are the most important:

The Accusative of Oaths. First that by which one swears is expressed by the accusative case (equals our English objective). In Gen. 21:23 we have "swear *by God* (*ton theon*)." This construction

is very common. To see the variety of its use consider all the following in which the simple accusative case is used: Deut. 32:40, "swear *by my right hand*"; Josh. 9:18, 19, "*by the Lord God*"; Prov. 24:32 (30:9), "*by the* (*thy*) *name*"; Hos. 14:15, "*by the living God*"; Isa. 65:16, "*by the true God.*"

This accusative of oaths is the standard Greek way from earliest times of expressing oaths and vows. The verb "swear" does not itself have to be expressed. Frequently asseverative particles such as *ma, men,* or *na* accompany the oath and the negative (*ou,* "not") and affirmative (*vai,* "yes") particles are quite typical. Compare Homer's *Iliad,* Book 1, 86, "for no one *by Apollo* (*ou ma gar Apollona*) shall lay hands on you." The expression "*by Apollo*" is expressed simply by the accusative case with *ma* which is not translated and is not necessary to the sense. Thus Moses swore to Israel that God would cause them to perish if they worshipped idols: "I witness to you *by heaven and earth* today (*diamarturomai humin semeron ton te ouranon kai ten gen*) that ye shall surely perish" (Deut. 4:26).

With the Preposition Kata. Secondly the verb swear is followed in many places by the preposition *kata* with the genitive case (equals English possessive). Compare Gen. 22:16, "I swore *by myself* (*kata emautou*)"; and see the following which use the same construction: Gen. 31:53, "*by the fear of his father*"; Ex. 32:23, "*by thyself*"; Judg. 1:12, "*by the throne*"; Amos 4:2, "*by his holy things*"; Isa. 62:8, "*by his glory*"; Jer. 28:51 (14), "*by his arm.*"

By the Dative with or without the preposition en *or* epi. The third common construction following the verb swear is with the simple dative case or with the preposition *en* or *epi.* In Deut. 6:13 we have, "Ye shall swear *by my name* (*to*[*i*] *onomati mou,* but some MSS have *epi* 'by' or 'on.')." The same construction occurs, for example, in 1 Kings 1:17, "*by the Lord*"; and in Ps. 88:35, "*by my holiness.*"

The other main verb for swearing in the O. T. Greek is *horkizo,* a causative which means. "I make someone swear." It also may be followed by the preposition *en*: Neh. 13:25, "I made them swear *by God* (*en theo*[*i*]); or by *Kata* with the genitive: 2 Chron. 36:13, "I adjured him *by God* (*kata theou*). Once the construction precedes the preposition *enantion,* "Joshua made them swear before the Lord" (Josh. 6:26).

Oaths made thus "before God" or "in the sight of God" are quite common to the whole Greek Bible, as are also oaths made by the use of the formula "as Jehovah liveth." See 1 Sam. 28:10, "And Saul swore to her, As Jehovah liveth, no injury shall come upon thee."

Oaths with Emphatic Future Negatives. One of the most interesting forms of oaths in the O. T. and one which has direct bearing on Jesus' use of oaths is the use of the conditional clauses using the particle "if" (*ei*) and the emphatic future negative. The full form of the condition would be something like the sentence in Ps. 7:4, "If I have requited evil, may I perish." Here the conclusion has the op-

tative of wish, very much like our, "If I am not telling the truth, I hope I die." Minus the conclusion (but with it understood) the condition was used as a regular formula for an oath. See Isa. 45: 23, "*By myself* I swear righteousness shall proceed out of my mouth" (*ei me exeleusetai ek stomatos mou*). This literally means, "*By myself* I swear if righteousness does not proceed out of my mouth . . ." A conclusion, such as "then may I die," "then I am a liar," "then I am nothing," etc., is to be supplied. The negative particle (as in the above one) is usually present, though the translation is almost always positive. For other instances of the usage consult such passages as I Sam. 28:10; 19:6; 14:11; 2 Sam. 19:7; Ps. 88:5; 94: 11; 131 (2):2; Ezek. 4:14; 14:16; 20:3, 31; 33:27. It is this type of oath which is quoted in Heb. 6:14 (quoted from Gen. 22:16f from the Hebrew, not the Septuagint) when the writer said that God swore "*by himself*" saying, "Surely blessing I will bless thee." The Greek (*ei men eulogon eulogeso*) is identical with the O. T. passages in this construction.

New Testament Oaths

The New Testament employs much the same constructions as the Old Testament. *Omnumi* ("I swear") (26 times in the N. T.) is followed by the preposition *en* (Rev. 10:5f, "swore *by the one living forever.*" Compare also Matt. 5:34f; 23:20ff). It also exhibits the use of *kata* with the genitive (Heb. 6:13, 16, "swear *by one greater,*" or "*by himself*"). The other word for swearing is the verb *horkizo* or its compound *enorkizo.* This root also here as in the O. T. is a causative and means to put someone under oath, to adjure, to demand testimony under oath. The usual construction for that by which one is adjured is the accusative of oaths. The construction is usually a double accusative, having also the accusative of the one adjured. Thus in Mark 5:7 the possessed man says, "I adjure thee *by God*" (*horkizo se ton theon*) and in Acts 19:13 we have "I adjure thee *by Jesus* whom Paul preaches." Paul is definitely using an oath formula when he says to the Thessalonians, "I adjure thee *by the Lord* (*ton kurion*) that this epistle be read aloud to all the brethren" (1 Thess. 5:27). This is quite in the custom of Paul for he frequently makes use of strong asseverations in the name of God in affirming or denying something. We have such expressions as "I call on God as witness" (2 Cor. 1:23; Rom. 1:9; Phil. 1:8), "God is my witness" (Phil. 1:8), "Before God, I lie not"; "I charge you before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and *by his appearing and kingdom*" (2 Tim. 4: 1ff. The last two expressions use the accusative of oaths). In 1 Cor. 15:31 Paul uses one of the particles of swearing (*ne*) with the accusative of oaths with the verb *omnumi* in elipsis: "*I swear* by our glorying (sc. [*omnumi*] *ne ten humeteran kauchesin*)." Compare also Acts 18:18 for Paul's taking a vow and see Num. 6:1-21 for the significance of such.

This verb may also be followed by the preposition *kata* with the

genitive of that by which one is adjured (just as in the O. T.). It was this form that the High Priest used in adjuring Jesus at his trial "*by the living God* (*kata tou theou tou zontos*)" to tell whether he was the Christ. This adjuration of the High Priest (Lev. 5:1) could not be avoided and Jesus answered simply, "I am" (Mark 14: 62).

Another most significant thing is Jesus' use of the typical Hebrew type of oath in his use of *ei* and the future indicative as described above from the O. T. and from Heb. 6:13ff in the New Testament. That this formula was used by Jesus in Mark 8:12 is certain. That it does not appear to be an oath from the English translation makes it all the more essential to study the identical wording of the many uses of the construction in the O. T. and Hebrews.

In the light of these facts all attempts to make something short of actual oaths out of all these N. T. passages concerning Jesus and Paul are doomed to failure. The grammar of the entire Greek and Hebrew Bibles is against such attempts to "absolve" Jesus and Paul from oaths.

Such attempts would not be necessary in the first place if the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount were interpreted rightly in its context. It is commonly thought that Jesus condemned swearing absolutely in the expression, "Swear not at all" (Matt. 5: 34). This understanding is quite contradictory to the oaths recorded by Jesus and Paul, hence the effort to make something less than oaths out of the language in all these places.

But did Jesus forbid oaths absolutely? We should remember that Jesus' "Swear not at all" is not followed by a period but by a series of negatives introduced by the particle *mete* ("neither"). These particles "divide the negative item into its component parts" (Arndt and Gingrich). That is, as McGarvey long ago pointed out, "The universal prohibition . . . is distributed by the specification of these four forms of oaths, and is therefore most strictly interpreted as including only such oaths." Thus the *actual words* of Jesus forbid only oaths taken "by heaven," "by the earth," "by Jerusalem," or "by the head." To take a parallel example, when Jesus said to the apostles in sending them out on the limited commission, "Take nothing with you," he did not give the command absolutely. He followed it as in Matt. 5:34 with a list of specifics all introduced by the same particle *mete*: "Take nothing with you, neither staves, (nor script, nor staff), nor bread, nor money, nor two coats." Nothing is prohibited except the specifics included in the prohibitions. It is quite obvious that *one* coat is even authorized. In Matt. 5:34 it is quite significant that oaths bearing the name of God are not included in the distributed specifications given. Hence, oaths of this type are not thought to be prohibited.[1]

---

[1]This exegesis is disputed, e.g., by G. W. Stewart: Art. "Oaths" in *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.* But he does not deal, in my opinion, with the total grammar of the passage.

What Jesus obviously condemned were the oaths mentioned in Matt. 23:16. Here Jesus condemned the Pharisees for avoiding swearing by the "greater" oaths so that they would not be bound to keep the oaths they made. This made these oaths mere profanity and their use hypocritical.

One might ask, "If Jesus is then reaffirming the O. T. principle that all oaths must be kept strictly, what is the difference in the teaching of Jesus and that of 'olden times' which he is contrasting?" The difference is that under the terms of the law an oath "*by heaven*" or "*by earth*" (as Moses used in Deut. 4:31) or any other oath not using God's name would have to be kept or bring the swearer under charge of profanity for forswearing himself. But since these oaths lent themselves to profanity in the way they were used, Jesus advised against any use of this type of oath in conversation. This is equivalent to teaching that all oaths should be avoided except those in solemn vows, and in civil and religious situations, and that these should be taken in the name of God and not in a lesser name.

James 5:12 is to be interpreted as a quotation of Jesus' words in Matt. 5:34 and as teaching the same thing. James does add, "nor by any other oath," but the word *allos* rendered "other" may mean and probably does here mean "any of the same kind."

This study would seem to show that the teaching of the New Testament on oaths is really a prohibition against thoughtless or light use of God's name or things created by God in an oath. It has no bearing against, yea it actually confirms, the scripturalness of solemn civil and religious oaths, vows, and pledges made "before God," "in his name," or "by him."

Abilene, Texas.

PERSONALIA

Frank Pack is Professor of Bible at Abilene Christian College and has made previous contributions to the journal.

Fausto Salvoni of Milano, Italy, last year's co-winner of the McGarvey Award, is a frequent contributor to various European journals and is widely heard as a speaker and lecturer in Europe.

Earl Irvin West, a former teacher at Freed-Hardeman College, Harding College, and the Harding School of Bible and Religion at Memphis, Tenn., is at present preaching in Indianapolis, Indiana, and continuing work toward his Ph.D. at the University of Indiana.

Thomas Olbricht (Book Review) has the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from State University of Iowa and is now working on the S.T.B. at Harvard Divinity School. He is minister of the church at Natick, Mass.

The English Puritan Struggle and the Question of Biblical Authority

Earl Irvin West

The Puritan conflict in England in the 16th and 17th centuries was one of the great struggles produced by the Protestant Reformation. The English Reformation had been a state action brought about by the reigning heads, Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Many Englishmen felt that the reform should be carried through without delay along scriptural lines. In this they were influenced by the continuing reform movement from the Continent.[1] Puritanism, of course, never accomplished its purpose in changing the Church of England and finally dwindled in power and split into many sects. It left its mark, however, on many phases of Protestant religion. Any struggle of conscience, and especially one in which the question of conformity to the Word of God was directly involved, is a matter of interest to those interested in the Restoration of New Testament Christianity.

This paper will investigate the causes of the Puritan conflict, especially the part the doctrine of Biblical authority played in the conflict. It will close with an evaluation of the part played in "reducing Puritanism" by Richard Hooker's imposing work, the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, which was written to counteract that doctrine.

Stated in the broadest terms, the causes of the Puritan conflict may be narrowed to two propositions: first, the Puritan conviction that the Reformation in England had stopped short of a complete return to first century Christianity, and second, the Anglican conviction that the triumph of Puritanism would be a severe blow—if not a death blow—to English nationalism.

Rowse has noted that Puritanism "when fully defined, was the Presbyterianism of Geneva."[2] That being true, it had clear objectives in mind. The Scriptures, being the word of God, should be the one rule of life for the church. Consequently, "the church of Puritan dreams would serve but one end, the greater glory of God, and live by one rule, the rule of the Scriptures."[3] Primarily, the Puritan objective would be "to carry on the reformation to its logical conclusion in a church entirely emancipated from the Roman tradition."[4]

To the English Puritan of Elizabethan times, the English church had done well in breaking with Romanism. Henry VIII—whatever may have been his motives—had done a real service to humanity in breaking the bonds that tied the church in England with the papacy. That was a good beginning, but why stop there? To the Puritan of Elizabeth's day it seemed clear that the Elizabethan Settlement of

[1]A. L. Rowse, *The England of Elizabeth* (New York, 1951), 406.
[2]Rowse, *ibid.*
[3]S. T. Bindoff, *Tudor England* (Baltimore, 1954), 230.
[4]J. B. Black, *The Reign of Elizabeth* (New York, 1936), 151.

1559 was intended to call a halt with the reformation at the present status quo. Therefore, Elizabethan Puritanism was "a comprehensive protest against the principle, the method, and the result of the settlement of 1559."[5]

There was then to the Puritan mind too much Romanism remaining in the English Church. The Prayer Book was an "imperfect book"; the Sacraments, full of unlawful ceremonies, and in the realm of discipline and church organization things were even worse. Here, notes Bindoff, "the Puritans made their most trenchant criticisms and most radical proposals."[6]

It should be noted in passing, however, that the stage for this phase of the conflict was set in the days of Henry VIII by Robert Barnes, a protege of Thomas Cromwell, whom Henry executed July 30, 1540. In common with other Puritans of his time, Barnes upheld the authority of the Scriptures and denounced the papacy. Knappen notes that Barnes "unwittingly laid the intellectual foundations for an anti-ceremonial drive among the Puritans."[7]

After collecting information on the lives of the popes, Barnes put special emphasis upon what innovation each had introduced into ecclesiastical worship. He made the contrast between the medieval church and the early church stand out. Knappen concludes that Barnes thought: "If these were of post-apostolic innovation, they were human additions to the gospel and so might be abolished."[8] Barnes expressed his views in his *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum* which he published from Wittenburg in 1535 and which he dedicated to Henry VIII. These views were carefully studied and mastered by William Turner.

Clearly, then, this represents an advancing stage in Puritan thoughts on reformation. From the theory that the Catholic Church, as a separate institution was wrong, the conflict centers on a new front: any vestige of Romanism found in the English Church was equally wrong. Knappen says,

> From this beginning a new theory of reformation was developed—a theory which was to be standard equipment for the Puritan party throughout its history. The assault was no longer directed at the Catholic religion as a separate and established institution—a strategy which had meant a concentration on its essential doctrine of justification, sacerdotalism and sacraments—but against the remnants of Catholicism in a church already partially reformed.[9]

So now, the potential field of reform was boundless, and the Puritan would not stop until he had completed the task.

Scarcely had Elizabeth come to the throne in November, 1558 until

---

[5]*Ibid.*
[6]Bindoff, *England*, 229.
[7]M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), 64.
[8]*Ibid.*, 65.
[9]*Ibid.*

the Puritans launched an attack over the vestments prescribed for the clergy by Royal Injunctions. The Puritan argument ran that the clergy should be known by their holy conduct instead of the type of vestments worn. In the four years that followed confusion brooded over the religious scene. Meanwhile, the Queen was faced with other problems, not the least of which centered around Mary Queen of Scots. If Elizabeth was having difficulties getting Mary to sign the Treaty of Edinburgh, she was having no less troubles in getting her cousin to marry Robert Dudley, whom Elizabeth in an elaborate ceremony had made the Earl of Leicester.[10]

When the discordant medley of religious controversy finally burst through the Queen's consciousness, she summoned her Archbishops of Canterbury and York and issued orders that measures be taken to create uniformity in the external rites and ceremonies of the church.[11]

Three years followed, however, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, presented his *Book of Advertisements* laying down fixed rules for worship. Parker made it clear that his rules were not found in the word of God but were temporary ecclesiastical orders.

The vehemence of the controversy in the mid 1560's was hardly less than it had been on the same question in Edward VI's time. Moreover, the Puritan goal was the same: rid the English Church of remnants of Catholic ceremonies and rites. Then John Hooper had turned loose a torrent of abuse against the Anglican party calling them "mashing, dreaming, children of this world, superstitious, and blind papists.[12] In reply Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, "made the welking ring with cries of Anabaptism. If the Scriptures," he cried, "be the only guide, we must abandon our churches, worship in homes, and baptize in the fields because the Apostles did so. We must follow the Anabaptist model and give up our property, because the early disciples left all to follow the Master. We must practice adult baptism. 'O wicked folly and blind ignorancy!' "[13]

For political reasons Elizabeth did not want uniformity enforced by the state so Parker's *Advertisements* was issued without the broad seal. Elizabeth's Bishops were generally left to bear the brunt of the assault, so it is not without some justification that the Puritan mind associated the Bishops as their enemies instead of the Queen. Thirty-seven percent of the clergy of London refused to obey Parker's *Advertisements.* Some left their offices while many who remained, openly voiced their opposition. On the whole the Puritans were adamant on the vestment question and struck back with an attack on the whole hierarchial structure of the church.[14]

---

[10]J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (Garden City, 1957), 117-135.
[11]Black, *Elizabeth,* 155.
[12]Knappen, *Puritanism,* 87.
[13]*Ibid.,* 88.
[14]Black, *Elizabeth,* 155.

By 1570 Elizabeth was again involved with other problems. Intrusting the religious affairs to the watchful eye of her chief adviser, the ubiquitous William Cecil—soon to become Lord Burghley—she gave her attention to the Ridolfi Plot, the excommunication by the pope, and the Scottish unrest. Meanwhile, the tempo of the Puritan conflict increased.

The Puritan onslaught in the spring of 1570 caused all eyes to focus on Cambridge where the newly elected Lady Margaret Professor, Thomas Cartwright, was delivering a series of lectures on Acts. Severely criticizing current conditions in the Church of England, Cartwright advocated Bishops with purely spiritual functions, Deacons to care for the poor, and church government which would be in the hands of a local presbytery.

In the two decades that followed, Cartwright was to be recognized as the intellectual leader of the Puritans. Born at Hertfordshire, he was at St. John's under Thomas Lever during Edward's reign. He was too young to distinguish himself as a Protestant and so did not join the Marian Exiles in their rush to the Continent. However, during the Vestiarian Controversy of the 1560's, he did go to Geneva to study under John Calvin.[15] A part of the time he was in Ireland as chaplain to Adam Loftus, Archbishop of Armagh.[16]

With Cartwright's lectures on Acts, the University was in an uproar. When the authorities appealed to Cecil, the latter took steps to deny Cartwright his D.D. degree and ordered the Puritans to refrain from discussing these controversial subjects. However, thirty-three members of the University signed petitions supporting Cartwright, so Cecil refused to be too severe. Whitgift sent special charges to the Court against Cartwright, but still Cecil was adamant. Finally by the fall of 1570 Cecil gave the University heads new powers to deal with the problem so in December, Cartwright was removed from the Lady Margaret Professorship. His influence now, as Froude says, became "'ten times greater."[17]

The Puritans waited patiently for Parliament to meet the next spring and then introduced a mass of anti-Catholic bills. They asked for legislation calling for "a general reformation along Puritan lines."[18] During the 1570 decade, the Puritan conflict reached the height of its intensity. Early in the decade the battle was largely centered in the House of Commons. In the spring of 1572, a bill was introduced to legalize Puritan nonconformity and proposing that the Act of Uniformity be imposed only against Romanists. For a time it appeared that the bill would pass; but when Lord Burghley informed the Queen, she asked that the bill be surrendered to her and in the future no bill be introduced to Parliament touching religion unless first approved by the Bishops.

---

[15]J. A. Froude, *History of England* (New York, 1867), Vol. 3, 115.
[16]Knappen, *Puritanism*, 234.
[17]Froude, *England*, 117.
[18]Knappen, *Puritanism*, 234.

Blocked in Parliament the Puritans now turned their attention toward the press. *An Admonition to Parliament* appeared in the spring of 1573, contrasting the church of the first century with the current establishment. Bishop Cooper answered the tract in a sermon at Paul's Cross and the authors were arrested and sent to Newgate. Soon Puritan answers to Cooper began to circulate, and a *Second Admonition to Parliament* appeared which, however, did not measure up to the first.

The Puritan conflict was hastening toward a showdown. Cambridge was full of "keen-minded young enthusiasts" who were anxious to reform the ecclesiastical system and restless to get at the job.[19] Knappen observed, "Outside of court circles no one at this time seems to have thought of Anglicianism as anything but a temporary expedient, an incomplete version of the Reformed system. Aquinas they knew and Calvin they knew, but who was Cranmer or Parker?"[20]

All hope in Elizabeth's Court that the conflict would die a natural death was abandoned. The circulating tracts must be answered and Thomas Whitgift was assigned the task. His previous exchange with Thomas Cartwright had established him as the latter's equal in intellectual acumen. While Cartwright was milder in tone, he asserted the Scriptural justification for a government of presbyters and deacons and strongly advocated democratic principles in the election of ministers.[21] On the basic authority of the Scriptures Cartwright was steadfast. "If the Scriptures," he contended, "were the authentic word of God, they must necessarily be a better guide to the right ordering of the church, on its disciplinary as well as its doctrinal side, than the opinion of men."[22]

Charges were hurled on both sides with Edwin Sandys, Archbishop of York and Matthew Parker keeping a close eye on developments and accusing the Puritans at aiming at "mere popularity."[23] Not until Elizabeth had put down the Scottish revolt and had taken a square look at the religious situation in her own realm did anything resembling peace appear on the horizon. Skillfully she sought to divide the Puritan forces "causing them to wear themselves out in mutual recriminations while she and her kind took what they liked."[24]

Meanwhile, the hopes of the Puritans were tied to the facile pens of her leaders. Virtually shut out of Parliament the Puritans could only wait for the outcome of the literary exchange between Thomas Cartwright and Thomas Whitgift. Cartwright stayed on the Continent until 1585 and from here waged his literary warfare with

---

[19]*Ibid.*, 220.
[20]*Ibid.*, 219.
[21]*Ibid.*, 237.
[22]Black, *Elizabeth*, 379.
[23]Knappen, *Puritanism*, 238.
[24]*Ibid.*, 245.

Whitgift. Joined by Walter Travers, a former fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge, the two produced a systematic treatise on the Puritan idea of Church Government. Entitled *De Disciplina Ecclesiastica,* the work was generally accepted as representing the party attitude and was defended as representing the true teachings of the Scriptures.

It should be noted before leaving this problem that the Puritan ideal for the English Reformation not only was aimed at ridding the church of all Romish rituals and doctrines because these were without authority in the Scriptures, but one prong of the Puritan offensive thrust hard at the Anglican Bishops. On two counts were the Bishops culpable: first, they were an autocratic group possessing powers beyond what the Scriptures permitted; second, they were engulfed in a sea of secularism that threatened the spiritual well-being of the whole church.

Since the days of Robert Barnes, observes Knappen, a corollary was laid down which said that true Christians should accept the Biblical standard of Jesus and the early church instead of the papal. All rituals and ceremonies except those having the express command of God were to be removed. This principle "was to be the cornerstone of Puritan teaching on the subject for years to come."[25] It was in line with this principle that the role of the Anglican Bishops came to be investigated.

Cartwright with both Calvin and Knox held no objection to a church government by Bishops, but these Bishops should be limited in power. The people constituting the churches should be allowed the freedom to select them. But the Anglican Bishops ruled virtually as autocrats. Here the line was drawn.

While most Puritans of Elizabeth's day were milder of temperament than the irascible Peter Wentworth, most were at least sympathetic with his point of view. Wentworth, a brother-in-law of Francis Walsingham's, and, as Neale says, a man "born to be in trouble" appeared before Archbishop Parker and the House of Lords to explain why Commons had cut out some of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Parker exploded in an impetuous outrage demanding that the Committee of which Wentworth was a member should henceforth refer themselves "wholly to us."[26] "No! by the faith I bear to God," cried Wentworth, "we will pass nothing before we understand what it is, for that were but to make you popes."

If an autocratic clergy offended the Puritan mind, a secular one proved equally as distasteful. The clergy were incompetent and unlearned preachers and in the case of the higher prelates had settled down to a life of lordly luxury. Nor did the Puritan alone see this side of the picture. Addressing the Lords of the Clergy, the Queen

---

[25]*Ibid.,* 67.
[26]Neale, *Elizabeth,* 324.

severely rebuked their sermons, ordering them to read the homilies for there was "more learning in one of these than in twenty of some of their sermons."[27] The Archbishop explained the difficulty of securing learned ministers to fill thirteen thousand parishes, but the Queen was unperturbed. If the Archbishop could not secure learned men, at least he could find ones that were honest, sober, and wise.

Charges of pluralism and unfaithfulness to clerical vows were hurled against leading Bishops, including Archbishop Parker. Criticisms of Cartwright and Travers had just enough venom to keep the Anglican Bishops scurrying about defending themselves.[28] Most Bishops were now married and had children which were as yet illegitimate in the eyes of the law. To provide for growing families the Bishops sought other ways besides clerical duties to raise money. So, pluralism, absenteeism, nepotism, racking of rents, and severity to tenants were among the charges most frequently stated against them. Besides Parker, Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, was especially culpable—a fact which no doubt cost him a promotion to the Archbishopric of Canterbury when Parker died in 1575.

Before turning to the Anglican point of view as a cause for the Puritan conflict, an observation should be made of the general pattern of the Puritan onslaught. Knappen, whose sympathies are not with the Puritans, finds frequent occasions to point out their insincerity. Stemming first from the writings of William Tyndale and coming down through Cartwright, Dering, and other leaders of the movement is the repeated reminder that the Puritans were loyal subjects of the Crown. They taught submission but practiced anarchy —so runs Knappen's criticism.

However, if the problem is viewed philosophically and from the Puritan point of view, the criticism appears less than just. If the laws of a State violate one's personal code of ethics, what should be his reaction? When one surveys the possibilities, only one of three courses is open to him: he might pursue a course of anarchy and seek to overthrow the government to force conformity to his ethics; he might overthrow his code of ethics and conform to the State; or, as a final choice, he might conform to the State while working to change the laws.

The problem, of course, is an ancient one. Socrates faced it when the laws of Athens condemned him to death. His friends felt the law was unjust and that the philosopher should seek escape. Instead Socrates pleaded for conformity to an unjust law while still working to get it changed.

This, then, was the predicament of the Puritan. The course of anarchy would scarcely help the Puritan cause, nor could he, believing as he did that his course of action conformed to the Divine

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 321.
[28] Knappen, *Puritanism*, 220.

Will, change his personal convictions. On perfectly utilitarian grounds, the only course of action open to the Puritan was to conform to the State while seeking to change the laws to conform to the Puritan ideals. It is an unavoidable defect of this philosophy that the person who holds it must act in times of crisis with strange inconsistency.

At any rate, the Puritan fought an aggressive battle, retiring to complete submission to Her Majesty's Government when no other course of action was opened.

As to the second cause of the Puritan conflict, it has been stated that this grew out of the Anglican conviction that the triumph of Puritanism would be a fatal blow to English nationalism. The Anglican eye saw behind every Puritan argument the pale shadow of Geneva casting its form across England's fair and fertile fields. Calvinism brooded over her pulpits and the grim spirit of internationalism was spreading its somber pall over her Parliaments. With the advent of the Tudors, English nationalism had burst out into full bloom. Now having breathed her fragrance Englishmen gyrated under the sheer ecstasy of her spell.

Elizabeth was quick to see that if the Presbyterian Church with its officers subject to popular election were established in England. it would involve drastic change in the social structure. It would be a blow at her prerogative, unseating her from being the head of the church and making her subject to it. It would erect an intolerable inquisition to pry into men's lives. Believing as she did that hers was the "true way to God's will," that Puritanism was incompatible with English society, she could only say: "God forbid that I should subscribe it to you."[29]

Speaking of the Puritans, Black says, "The political doctrines underlying their whole 'platform' were inimical to the whole structure of Tudor Government."[30] Clearly, then, Puritanism was a danger to the peace of the whole realm. It was not without some justification that the Puritan mind held that "the Established Church appeared less concerned with seeking the Kingdom of God than with supporting the Kingdom of England. It set uniformity before truth and conformity before conscience . . ."[31]

Anglicans saw this threat to their nationalism very early. During the time of the Marian Exiles' stay at Frankfurt, the spectrum of nationalism played in the shadows behind the noise of the main controversy. Between the Coxians and the Knoxians a great gulf was fixed. Richard Cox's love for Puritanism was tempered by his love for England while the truculent John Knox cared nothing for England or the "monstrous rule of women."

---

[29]Neale, *Elizabeth*, 321.
[30]Black, *Elizabeth*, 151.
[31]Bindoff, *England*, 230.

If the Puritan ideal was a church conforming to the pattern of the Scriptures, the Anglicans also had an ideal although somewhat of a different character. Froude calls the Church of England "a latitudinarian experiment, a contrivance to enable men of opposing creeds to live together without shedding each other's blood."[32] It was not possible for either Catholics or Protestants to find in the church all they wanted. So, Froude continues, "The services were deliberately made elastic, comprehending in the form of positive statement only what all Christians agreed in believing, while opportunities were left open by the rubric to vary the ceremonial according to the taste of the congregation."

Behind the Anglican ideal of reformation was the assumption that the Church of Rome was full of errors, but still the true church. The errors of the Roman Church were of medieval origin, so to the Anglican mind, to return to the fourth or fifth centuries before these errors began was sufficient. To the Puritan this position was untenable.

Furthermore, the Anglican ideal envisioned a church with a pleasant mixture of Protestantism and Romanism. Few wanted to throw overboard the aesthetic appeal of the Roman ceremonies. A fair potion of Protestant doctrines sprinkled with a touch of nationalism should bring a church to suit everybody. As the Queen saw it, nobody's conscience would be molested with every English subject thinking as he pleased. Moreover, no inquisition would examine the public's opinions.[33] What was more important to Elizabeth was that this church would support the State so that England, while geographically isolated from the nations of Europe, would find in her solitude the real architect of her strength.

It was a pleasant enough ideal for a Queen, but it would scarcely suit a people resolved upon returning to the authority of the Scriptures. Here, then, as Richard Hooker was later to say, was "the head theorem of all their discourses."[34] If the authority of the Bible must be respected, there was no possible compromise short of this. The meeting of these two irresistible forces—the Puritan mind with its insistence upon a recognition of the authority of the Scriptures and the Anglican mind with its broad compromise aimed at strengthening the State—produced the Puritan conflict. By the eve of Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* when no sign of a compromise had appeared on the horizon, the Queen was forced to sterner measures.

Upon the death of Matthew Parker in 1575 Lord Burghley recommended Edmund Grindal to be archbishop. From Elizabeth's point of view the choice was unfortunate. Grindal, pious, mild-mannered, unmarried, gentle in spirit and personally charitable, had

---

[32]Froude, *England*, 108, 109.
[33]*Ibid.*, 109.
[34]*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book II, Chap. I, Sec. 3.

strong pro-Puritan leanings. He was hardly more than settled in office until he clashed with the Queen.

The practice of lectureships had grown up gradually in Elizabethan England, but by Grindal's day was in full swing. The Elizabethan age took its preaching seriously. Preaching was considered a difficult art. Preachers were expected to spend hours at their study. Some churches engaged an extra preacher for preaching duties alone. By 1571 the Inns of Court held a lectureship and the same year the Temple in London employed two preachers. Here in 1584 Richard Hooker was lecturing each morning with Walter Travers doing the same in the afternoon. The seven years' discussions that followed influenced Hooker profoundly to write his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.*

Ostensibly the lectureships were conducted for the benefit of the clergy although the laity were invited. The primary object was to study the Scriptures. In time these became boiling caldrons of opposition to the Anglican Church. So it was against these that the Queen ordered her Archbishop to act. Grindal, however, was too moderate and diplomatic and Elizabeth was angered. The Archbishop was confined to his house for six months and to all practical intents and purposes was dismissed from office.

When, however, Thomas Whitgift followed Grindal as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, the story was to be different. Possessing a strong dislike for Puritans in general and Cartwright in particular, the new Archbishop felt the time for argument was past, and it was time for action. He was determined to reduce Puritanism. His cure for the troubled times was to have in England a church as absolute and infallible as that of Rome.[35] No sooner was he in office than all the clergy were forced to take an oath involving three controversial issues: first, the acceptance of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown; second, the Book of Common Prayer as containing nothing contrary to Scripture and third, to agree that the Thirty-Nine Articles were in agreement with the word of God.

A storm of protest now raged around the indomitable Archbishop but to no avail. Two hundred ministers were deposed and the advancement of scores of others was blocked. It was at this point that Richard Hooker was advanced to the lectureship at the Temple. "A fine spirited controversialist," observes Knappen, "he also saw no particular virtue in internationalism, and in his splendid English did his magnificent best to justify nearly all Elizabeth's ways to those who would listen or read."[36]

Whitgift's chief weapon was the ecclesiastical commission which gave him broad disciplinary powers while dispensing with the formalities of law. With the coercive powers of the State behind him,

---

[35]Black, *Elizabeth*, 162.
[36]Knappen, *Puritanism*, 274.

Whitgift moved quickly. Suspects were forced to take the oath. Upon refusing they were handed over to the Court of Star Chamber for punishment. If they were found guilty, they were either fined or imprisoned without the right of appeal. With the capable help of Richard Bancroft. a man of great ability and possessing a unique knowledge of all the ramifications of the Puritan movement, Presbyterian leaders were lured before the Commission and dealt with sternly. Among those going to prison in 1589 was Thomas Cartwright himself who remained there until 1592. John Udall was sent to prison in 1590 under sentence of death and died there before he was executed. Three Puritan "fanatics"—Coppinger, Arthington, and Hacket—were accused of plotting to take the life of the Queen and were executed in 1592.[37]

While all this was going on, Elizabeth maintained a close vigil on Parliament to see that the Puritans got no help from that source. When Sir Anthony Cope introduced a bill sweeping away all ecclesiastical law and demanding a new Prayer Book, he was sent to the tower.[38] For having spoken in his defense, the fiery Peter Wentworth was sent there too and ultimately died there.[39] Still later, when Anthony Morrice of the Court of Wards introduced a bill abolishing oaths and subscriptions and demanding that unlawful imprisonments and restraints of liberty be stopped, he was deprived of office and spent several years in prison at Tutbury Castle.[40]

Clearly, then, Anglicianism, like Puritanism, had its ideal and its pattern of procedure. They would stop Puritanism by argument if possible but if not, at least by force. The latter was to be used only when everything else failed. The Puritan pattern called for keeping the attack going as long as possible and yielding only when nothing else was possible. By the end of Elizabeth's reign the Puritan onslaught had slowed to a walk while the voices of her leaders died amid the shadows of their prison cells.

While Whitgift cracked down hard within the church and while Elizabeth kept a close eye on Parliament, Whitgift prepared another prong of an over-all Anglican counter-offensive. After the years of controversy Richard Hooker appealed to Whitgift for removal to a quieter place to continue his writings. He was just closing a seven-years "gladiatorial contest" with Walter Travers in the Temple Church in London and was, as he wrote the Archbishop, "weary of the noise and opposition of this place, and indeed God and nature did not intend me for contentions, but for study and quietness."[41] The next July, 1591, he retired to the country parsonage of Boscombe

---

[37]Black, *Elizabeth*, 162.
[38]*Ibid.*, 166.
[39]Bindoff, *England*, 233.
[40]Black, *Elizabeth*, 166.
[41]Izaak Walton, "The Life of Mr. Richard Hooker" in John Keble, *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1849), Vol. 1, 89.

in Wiltshire. Within three years the first four books of this *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* had appeared. The fifth was published in 1597. The remaining three were completed before he died in 1600, but they were not published for several years.[42]

Hooker was ideally suited both in temper and background for the task ahead. Well read in the patristic scholarship of his time, in Aristotle and the Schoolmen, and in Classical Literature, he brought all of his vast resources to bear upon the problem. A completely humble man—and just as completely unaware of it—Hooker approached his writings with the feeling that he himself was likely to err. He was weary of dialectics, so he approached the work with a philosopher's mind. He sought for common grounds of agreement often stating his opponent's position with a generous sprinkling of caution, fairness, and tact. Rowse feels that as a result Hooker arose above the level of controversy, producing a work that displayed intellectual maturity.[43] While the writing was in progress, Whitgift, George Cranmer, and Edwin Sandys were aware that Hooker was producing a classic, but to Hooker the only object seemed to be reconciliation. He would "satisfy tender consciences" by establishing an intellectual foundation which all could accept as a basis of agreement.[44]

It must not be forgotten that to the Puritans the doctrine of the "unique and complete authority of the Bible" was their guiding principle and constituted both the strength and weakness, as Knappen calls it, of their position.[45]

The Puritans held the sixty-six books of the Bible to be the only authority Christians could recognize. That popes and councils could and often did err was evident to them. Traditions were worthless, being but the inventions of men. To the Puritan "what was not prescribed in the Bible must not be used in the Church."[46]

The reason for the authority of the Bible lay primarily in its divine nature. Furthermore, it was to be taken literally with no allegorical, anagogical, and tropological interpretations permitted. All philosophy and carnal reason were ruled out as a means of understanding the Scriptures. The Bible could be understood if people studied it and compared the context.

Echoing Augustine, Catholics maintained that no one could see clearly what the Bible taught unless the organized Church held the candle and pointed in the right direction.[47]

When Hooker wrote the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, "he set the

---

[42]Black, *Elizabeth*, 380.
[43]Rowse, *Elizabeth*, 484.
[44]Black, *Elizabeth*, 381.
[45]Knappen, *Puritanism*, 354.
[46]*Ibid.*, 356.
[47]*Ibid.*, 60.

whole controversy for the first time in a wide framework, and brought it into vital touch with the learning of the renaissance."[48] "As a controversialist," Black notes, "he had no equal in his time, and his learning was encyclopedic."[49]

So important did Hooker consider the question of Biblical authority that he devoted his entire Second Book to it and referred to it, as has already been seen, as "the head theorem of all their discourses." If the Puritans would yield on only two points, he maintained, the controversy would end. Those were: first, that the Scriptures should only be used within the compass of moral action; second, that the Puritans should cease exacting at the hands of the Anglicans some place in Scripture that would justify their every action.[50]

To Hooker the Scriptures were excellent for the purpose for which they were intended—to reveal the supernatural way of salvation which reason alone could not reveal. He contended that Anglican practices were not founded on the Scriptures but could be justified by appealing to the "law of reason."

The silence of the Scriptures did not, to Hooker, mean any more than that the church had a liberty here to make laws for her own being. She could choose whatever polity she preferred provided she did not infringe upon the laws and commandments laid down in the Bible. Hooker proposed to stand beside Augustine who demanded that every man confirm his sentence by the Scriptures "or by some reason not contrary to them."[51]

In attempting an evaluation of the effect Hooker's writings had on "reducing Puritanism" at the end of Elizabeth's reign, it must be admitted that a categorical answer is impossible. There were too many other factors involved.

First, the phrase "reducing Puritanism" is itself susceptible of different interpretations. By James I's accession only a comparatively few Puritans were found who completely repudiated the Prayer Book and episcopal authority. However, their number was legion who still wanted more reform than Elizabeth had permitted.[52] As a noisy element trying to control Parliament Puritanism had been "reduced." But the number among the populace who held in general the Puritan viewpoint was still surprisingly large. Black estimates that at the close of Elizabeth's reign there were between two hundred eighty-one and three hundred fifty ministers and from fifty thousand to one hundred thousand laymen.[53]

But other influences were also present, foremost among them being

---

[48]Black, *Elizabeth*, 380.
[49]*Ibid.*
[50]Richard Hooker, *Laws*, 197.
[51]*Ibid.*, 201.
[52]J. R. Tanner, *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689* (Cambridge, 1957), 10, 11.
[53]Black, *Elizabeth*, 379.

the Queen herself. More than any other single factor she was the leading cause in reducing Puritanism. Rowse says,

> The greatest stumbling-block—and in the end it proved an insuperable one—was that the Queen thought it had gone too far already and was determined to hold to the compromise of 1559 to her dying day. She was far more determined than the bishops, who had to bear all the unpopularity, growing to an intense hatred, for the execution of her policy: she herself would never come into the open in this region where the irrational element in human beings is capable of anything. Dr. Knappen says truly of her character, nothing ever changed her; what she had accepted as a young woman of twenty-five she was still holding to as a middle-aged woman when the Puritan campaign was at its height; she had not changed when she laid down her task, sick and weary of it, though by then Puritans had been defeated and scattered, driven underground or out.[54]

With the passing of the Queen's reign various reasons contributed to her popularity. She had been firm without being ruthless. She had set for herself a middle course and pursued it. In the end her subjects came to see the wisdom of her way. With the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 Catholicism was no longer a threat. Furthermore, the Queen was at the height of her popularity. The firm show of her hand would be all that would be necessary.

Still another factor, found within Puritanism itself, helped to drive it underground. That was the tendency of Puritanism to divide into fragments. At Plumber's Hall in London in 1567, an attempt was made to break away and form a "separatist" organization. It ended in failure, and the leaders were sent to prison. By 1580 another effort was made to establish an Independent Church with Robert Browne and Henry Barrow as leaders. "The root principle of their teaching," says Black, "was that the close connexion between Church and State, symbolized by Anglicianism and upheld by Presbyterians, was unscriptural and ought to be abolished."[55] Their enthusiasm gave an emotional touch to religion lacking in both Anglicianism and Puritanism.

When all these factors are considered, it is clear that Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* could lay small claim to the victory over Puritanism. When it is remembered, too, that men are seldom governed purely by intellectual considerations—even if one should admit the validity of all Hooker's arguments—it would be even more evident that Hooker's writings could not lay claim to reducing Puritanism.

On the question of Biblical authority as it was argued pro and con by Puritans and Anglicans, weaknesses are evident on both sides. This paper has attempted to avoid being a polemic so as not to lose sight of the historical events—their causes, patterns, and consequences.

Indianapolis, Indiana.

---

[54]Rowse, *Elizabeth*, 466.
[55]Black, *Elizabeth*, 164.

Book Reviews

Editor, Pat Harrell

Church History

A History of the Christian Church, Revised Edition, by WILLISTON WALKER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959. 585 pp. $5.50.

Since many readers are no doubt familiar with the classic one volume church history by Williston Walker, this review will be limited to the new features of the revised edition. Three professors in church history at Union Theological Seminary are responsible for the revision: Cyril Richardson for the section up to the early Middle Ages, Wilhelm Pauck through the Reformation, and Robert Handy, the modern period.

The main change made by Professor Richardson is the inclusion of insights gained since the time of Walker. A paragraph has been included on the Essenes, prompted by the modern findings at Qumran. The material on the Cappadocian Fathers has been revised to conform with the results of recent studies. This is an area in which Professor Richardson has devoted special research and his added insights are of value. The revising, however, is not consistent. The information on Gnosticism remains the same, despite much recent investigation. The statement on Pelagianism also stands as Walker wrote it notwithstanding the discovery in 1943 of twelve new works of Pelagius. The chapter headings have remained the same throughout, and most of the writing is still that of Walker.

Professor Pauck's main change is in the chapter on the Anabaptists, a needed revision in view of studies since Walker first wrote his work. Interestingly, Pauck followed Walker's chapter headings, but changed the word "revolt" to "reformation" in several instances, and this in face of the Roman Catholic preference for the appellation "revolt," and their conviction that Protestants are increasingly employing this term. It is somewhat disappointing that Professor Pauck did not include new insights into the reforms of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, but Walker's original material here was excellent.

The most extensive revision and that most needed is the work of Professor Handy in the Modern period. While Professor Walker excelled in his discussion of European Christianity, his knowledge of the American church, at least as evidenced in his work, was not on the same level. Professor Handy has remedied this weakness by adding chapters on American church history and revising the American background in others. He has also added a chapter on the

Eastern Churches, the omission of which in the older work indicates a parochialism too long characteristic of western church historians, and a chapter on the Ecumenical Movement. As an indication of the greater accuracy which Professor Handy has brought to the work, in discussion of the "Restoration Movement" Walker did not mention Barton W. Stone, while Handy briefly identifies his place and contribution. Walker, in addition, stated that the separation of the Campbell Reformers from the Baptists was completed by 1827, while Handy gives 1832, a date more representative of the course of events.

The greatest advantage of the new edition is its excellent bibliography which offers the person who desires added information a listing of recent studies in the various areas. The bibliography is outstanding in its listing of general works, but with certain exceptions, is less suggestive in works on men and denominations. Foreign titles are infrequently listed, but some of the more outstanding ones are included. The book is considerably improved in format, and in the mechanical aspects of readability. The revision enables the originally excellent work by Walker to compare favorably with any of the recently written one volume histories of the Christian Church.

Thomas H. Olbricht
Natick, Massachusetts

The New Light Christians, by COLBY E. HALL. Fort Worth: Stafford - Lowdon Co., 1959. 152pp.

In the past ten years several books have appeared which have penetrated into the thought and activity of the early giants of the "Restoration Movement." This book, by Professor Hall, is designed to unfold certain aspects of the "New Light" movement of which Barton W. Stone was the chief figure, which hitherto have been passed over by the historians.

The early chapters relate Stone's contact with the instigators of the Second Great Awakening which swept the western frontier, and the vital part which he played in this revival. Emphasized are Stone's personal struggle with "experimental religion" and his eventual conversion. Hall rightly points out that the influence of Stone's own conversion on his later preaching and thought has often been overlooked. In these chapters Stone is permitted to speak for himself by the use of long quoted sections from the *Autobiography*. This approach is of particular value since the *Autobiography* is not generally available.

The body of the book concerns how Stone's view of conversion led him and others to separate from the Presbyterian Church which was still strongly Calvinistic. He became persuaded that conversion is possible for all men and not limited to those elected of God. Also of influence in the decision to sever relations with the Presbyterians was the undenominational approach of the Camp Meetings in which preachers of all faiths combined their efforts to "convert" the lost.

This led to the desire of Stone and others to "sink into union with the body of Christ at large."

With that decision Stone turned more and more to the Bible. Hall shows that Stone, even before Scott and the Campbells, reached the conclusion that baptism is for the remission of sins, but did not offer this belief in his preaching since he found that it brought a cold reception when he attempted to substitute it for the mourner's bench experience. Especially interesting is the material on Stone's use of the mourner's bench, which perhaps he himself had helped originate in the Camp Meetings. This practice continued to be a vital part of the "New Light" approach until the merger with the Campbell reformers in the 1830's.

Hall's book is short but it discusses an interesting epoch in American church history and the history of the reformers. Only in the past few years have early revivalism and the Camp Meetings received their rightful attention in scholarly enterprises. Stone's participation and influence in this epoch is only now being properly recognized.

While this book makes a valuable contribution, it is not thorough or comprehensive enough to be considered a "History of the New Lights." The last part of the book concerns the union with the body of Christian Disciples, a topic which is much more thoroughly presented in W. G. West's *Barton Warren Stone*. The chief value of the book lies in its discussion of the early aspects of the Stone movement and its method of evangelism before the merger.

Thomas H. Olbricht
Natick, Massachusetts

New Testament

Die Apostelgeschichte. By Ernst Haenchen. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. 661 pp. approx. $7.56.

The Acts of the Apostles. By C. S. C. Williams. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957. xvi + 301 pp. $4.00.

The Acts of the Apostles. By Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959. xiv + 434 pp. $6.95.

Readers of the *Restoration Quarterly* are probably more aware than most other students of the Bible of the importance of the Book of Acts for a clear understanding of the first century church. It should therefore be an occasion for joy to note the appearance of three recent commentaries on this book. These three commentaries are a worthy addition to the work of Foakes Jackson and Lake represented in their monumental five-volume *Beginnings of Christianity,* and the two more recent commentaries by F. F. Bruce. The three commentaries under review are volumes in three series of commentaries on the New Testament. It is a source of gratification that the present interest in Biblical studies has resulted in the production of books of this quality. The presuppositions and aims of the three commentaries are totally different. Consequently there is a wide diver-

gence in their approach to problems, and in their treatment of the material at hand. The basic difference in attitude toward Acts can be illustrated by their views on its authorship.

Haenchen's commentary is in the tradition of critical German scholarship. It is part of the series of critical-exegetical commentaries founded by Wilhelm Meyer, and is Haenchen's third edition. One hundred and three pages are devoted to introductory matters. This exhaustive German treatment, which at times is also exhausting, does not leave much undiscussed. The last five-sixths of the book contains the commentary proper. In every pericope, the author gives a German translation of the section, followed by a linguistic and textual discussion based upon the Greek text. Finally, a general discussion of the pericope as a whole serves to synthesize the material already brought out. This last feature is especially welcome in a German commentary. Fragmentation has almost become the keyword in European scholarship. Haenchen betrays an excellent knowledge of both primary and secondary material. His knowledge of both the Greek and Jewish background reflects a grasp and maturity of judgment that is not usually found in the first major published works of many men. It can safely be said that this work is by far the best of its kind today. It alone is reason enough for the serious student to acquire some facility in German.

On the matter of authorship, Haenchen advances the position usual in liberal scholarship. For him, the author of Acts was evidently not Luke, the companion of Paul, but a Paulinist of a later generation. The testimony of the second century church that it was indeed Luke, is not convincing to him. In his evaluation of this view he would approximate the position of Cadbury, who says that the ascription of the authorship to Luke was due to a bad guess in the second century. Haenchen's arguments to prove that the author was not a companion of Paul show the usual subjective approach of this type of scholarship when it is not bound by a text. The main reasons that Luke could not have written the book according to him, are (1) the author and Paul have different understandings of the Gentile mission (2) The picture of Paul in Acts does not agree with that of Paul himself (Acts, for example, presents Paul as a great miracle worker and orator, characteristics which we do not find Paul ascribing to himself), (3) Acts does not show the same relationship between the Gentiles and the Jews that we find in Paul.

Williams, whose commentary is published in this country in the series known as *Harper's New Testament Commentaries*, and in Britain as *Black's New Testament Commentaries*, is much more diffident in his approach. After weighing the evidence, he states that it is "extremely probable that the author of the we-sections wrote the rest of Acts and the Third Gospel" (p. 7), and that it is quite possible that Acts was written before A.D. 70. The usual good point is made

that if it were written after this date, the destruction of Jerusalem would surely be mentioned or reflected. Williams gives his translation, and bases his commentary upon it. His comments are brief, and sometimes even sketchy. His references to secondary literature render the book somewhat unwieldy because of the practice of referring to it in brackets in the text, instead of in footnotes. Williams' approach to problems is in the nature of presenting a compendium of views on the various facets. With his British desire for perspective, and his insistence upon playing the game and being fair, he is very hesitant to make decisions, and when he does make suggestions one way or the other, he is sometimes half-hearted. We too should be fair, however, and recognize the aims of the author, according to the publisher. "No cut and dried solutions to the many questions posed by Acts are put forward, but the reader is given solid evidence on which to base his own conclusion." It is refreshing, at least, to read a book that recognizes that problems do exist, and yet is not too dogmatic or too facile in handling them.

The commentary by Carter and Earle appears in the new series, *The Evangelical Bible Commentary,* published by Zondervan Publishing House. In the words of the publishers, this "series is 'evangelical' in the historic sense, being sympathetic to the principles of the evangelical revival of the 18th century. As such, it seeks to maintain the combination of sound scholarship and spiritual insight for which the commentary of Adam Clarke is justly famous." This statement indicates what is at once positive and negative in the commentary under review. On the one hand, it is conservative, but on the other, it is too concerned with presenting the orthodox positions which have been established by the giants of the past, instead of meeting the problems head-on. One should again notice the purpose of the authors, however. "While the authors have aimed at a high level of accuracy and scholarship, the purpose of the commentary is practical rather than theoretical" (p. ix). In keeping with this the introduction takes up only three and one-half pages. As the footnotes clearly indicate, there is a great dependence upon Ramsay and Foakes Jackson and Lake for background material, and upon Harnack and Bruce for aid in solution of difficulties.

When reading the last two commentaries, the reviewer was reminded of a remark ascribed to Frank Dobie, the novelist of Texas, when he was asked why he never obtained a Ph.D. degree. He replied that the writing of a thesis was what prevented him from earning the degree. Scholarly research, to him, was like digging up a lot of dead bones out of one hole and putting them into another. One has the impression of a lot of dead bones lying around, especially in the last book. This tendency among conservatives to confuse a knowledge of the issues with an ability to solve the problems is cause for little comfort. To know what has

been said is only the first step. We delude ourselves when we justify our own lethargy by saying that everything has already been taken care of, and that the issues are all old. To continue using the metaphor of dry bones, and to adapt Ezekiel's vision, we must realize that unless we have a new spirit within us, we shall be forced to say, "Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off."

Nevertheless, all three commentaries are successful in their own ways. The commentary of Haenchen is the best one-volume commentary on Acts today, despite its presuppositions, and is without doubt indispensable for any advanced work in the Book of Acts. That of Williams is also successful, insofar as it sets out to present on a more popular plane the problems involved in the book, and the different attempts that have been made at solving them. The commentary of Carter and Earle is pre-eminently a work for the preacher, and in this respect will be of great service.

Abraham J. Malherbe
Lexington, Massachusetts

Theology

An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. By ALAN RICHARDSON. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958. 423 pp. $5.00.

Alan Richardson, Professor of Christian Theology in the University of Nottingham, has become well known for the clarity and convincing manner with which he can present a subject. He is best known as the author of *Christian Apologetics* and the editor of *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible.* Dr. Richardson is pre-eminently a teacher, and his books are always written with a view toward the value that they can have for the student. They are not to be regarded as a mere academic exercise, however. In the case of the book under review, for instance, the author says, "If this book does not help in the task of preaching the faith of Jesus Christ in the second half of the twentieth century, it will have failed in its purpose." The combination of scholarly concern and dedication in faith has resulted in a stimulating tool for the study of New Testament theology.

Before the appearance of this welcome book, the two main Theologies of the New Testament were those of Stauffer and Bultmann, written from quite disparate points of view. Neither of them is quite suitable as a text for the study of the New Testament. Happily, the book of Dr. Richardson comes closer to filling the gap.

When surveying the results of New Testament scholarship over the last fifty years, one might well ask if there is enough unity in the New Testament to warrant a "New Testament Theology." Dr. Richardson answers that the only way to show that this question can be answered affirmatively, is to frame a hypothesis concerning the theology of the underlying New Testament documents, and then to test this hypothesis by reference to the text of those documents in the light of the techniques of New

Testament scholarship, historical, critical, literary, philological, archæological, and so on. To the charge that this is unscientific, he replies that this method is as scientific as any other science. No scientist ever begins with an open mind, but he gets a "hunch," frames a hypothesis, and checks it against the available data. When a Christian writes a New Testament theology, he begins with the apostolic faith as his hypothesis. This book therefore defends the hypothesis that "Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation . . . which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, 'signs,' passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the 'data' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current today" (p. 12).

Richardson has an axe to grind with those theologians who base their theology of the New Testament upon humanist or existentialist insights, and it is not difficult to see shades of Bultmann in front of him. Until the humanists or the existentialists offer a more credible theology, "we shall continue to believe that acceptance of the apostolic witness to Christ's Lordship and to his resurrection makes better sense of the historical evidence than any other hypothesis" (p. 13). The relation of New Testament theology to faith for the author, then, is that it provides the means by which we may always be ready with a defense when we are asked for the reason of our Christian hope.

Professor Richardson is what is considered a conservative in Europe. In this country, however, he would be regarded as being closer to the left wing than the right. He accepts, for instance, the Pauline authorship of Ephesians and Colossians, but would think that Peter's sermons in Acts were only ascribed to him by the author. Although his theology is essentially a Biblical theology, he does approach the New Testament from within the framework of the church. His view of the unity of the church betrays rare insight, and is stated with great force. "The only words by which 'denominations' or 'churches' (in the sense of 'the confessions') could be translated into NT Greek would be *schismata* and *haireseis*; if we used words in their Biblical meaning only, we would have to speak of the 'World Council of Schisms and Heresies'" (p. 286).

His illuminating discussion of and emphasis on the sacrificial imagery of the New Testament makes clear that he is from a tradition in which sacramentalism is at the center. He insists upon the sacrificial doctrine of the Lord's Supper and predictably goes to the patristic exegesis of Malachi 1:11 as a proof for its presence in the New Testament. Similarly, infant baptism is defended, and the charge is made that opponents of it do so more as the result of the rationalistic and individualistic attitudes of renaissance humanism than from a right understanding of the NT teaching about faith and justifi-

cation. Richardson finds a comrade-in-arms in Oscar Cullmann, here, and rejoices in his company, except that he asserts that circumcision, and not proselyte baptism, is the true analogy in Judaism to Christian baptism. He even agrees with Cullmann's doubtful assertion that the phrase "forbid them not" (*me koluete auta*) in Mark 10:14, referring to the little children, alludes to a baptismal rite in the early church, where the question "what hinders?" (*ti koluei*) was asked before the baptism (cf. Acts 8: 38; 10:47). As in the usual discussions of this subject, so also here, at the end, one sees that there is a recognition of the essential weakness of the case that has been built, in the statement, "The important question, however, is whether the practice of infant baptism is in accord, not with possible interpretations of certain passages in the Gospels, but with the principles of NT theology as a whole" (p. 361). One is suspicious that it is not, indeed, even NT theology as a whole that is responsible for this acceptance of infant baptism, but a particular view of the church. Dr. Richardson himself points in this direction when he admits that believer's baptism makes a contribution to the full understanding of baptism, and hastens to add, "Yet this witness can never become the faith of the Church as such, nor can it set aside the wisdom of the Church of the ages" (p. 362).

These criticisms are not meant to detract from this book, but are offered to show that once its presuppositions are kept in mind, its emphases become obvious. It therefore becomes a valuable tool for the study of the message of the NT.

Abraham J. Malherbe
Lexington, Massachusetts

Marriage

A Christian Interpretation of Marriage. By HENRY A. BOWMAN. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 128 pages. $2.50.

This work is styled as the endeavor of a professional sociologist to interpret marriage for Christians in a Christian culture. At the outset he makes the distinction between marriage and Christian marriage; then he further limits himself to non-Catholic Christianity. In the earlier part of the book, Mr. Bowman quite beautifully applies Christian categories to marriage, categories like commitment to perfection, ideal of ego surrender, and faith. He announces the Christian and Biblical value of sex as being good and with dual purpose—communion and reproduction.

In one chapter he discusses pre-marital relations in the light of current customs. Much in the manner of a counselor, he ultimately casts his weight against this practice. But later in the book, he seems to find it hard to come out strongly as opposing divorce. Here he gets somewhat involved in NT exegesis. It may be that in this way he reveals himself more Protestant than Christian, but his leniency should also be regarded as adjustive to an existing situation as well as a reaction against a Catholic ex-

treme. He also has a word on interfaith marriage that is very sensible.

Generally speaking, *A Christian Interpretation of Marriage* should prove a very useful text for the counselor who wants to remain true to the spirit of Jesus. The book is very readable and is equipped with appendices on NT passages, questions, bibliography, and classroom suggestions.

Russel Jay Carver
Littleton, Massachusetts

Towards Christian Marriage. By W. Melville Caper and H. Morgan Williams Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1958. 128 pp. $2.25.

Growing Up To Love. By H. Clair Amstutz. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1958. 103 pp. $2.50.

All who are called upon to counsel—parents, elders, ministers, will welcome these important books. In the first volume two well qualified British doctors discuss in clear and understandable language the institution of marriage against the background of Christian ideals. It is not merely a compendium of biological information, but a real probing of the meaning of marriage for Christians. In an appendix is an excellent treatment of mixed marriages. Every facet of this work makes it ideal to recommend to maturing young people.

The second book, also written by a physician, is a guide to sex education for parents. Dr. Amstutz writes in a most lucid style to show the importance of wholesome attitudes on the part of the parents in helping the child to grow up to love.

Abe Malherbe

SHORTER NOTICES ON BOOKS RECEIVED

Bible

Calvin: Commentaries. Edited by Joseph Haroutunian. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958. pp. 413. $5.00.

This work is Volume XXIII in the series, *The Library of Christian Classics,* and is representative of the general quality of the series. The plan of the book is that of a compendium of Calvin's views of nine subjects, gathered from his commentaries on the Bible. The selections show the brilliance of Calvin the scholar, yet also make clear how much he was a child of his times.

You and Your Bible. By R. A. Torrey. Fleming H. Revell Company, 1958. pp. 220. $3.00.

This is an anthology from the many writings of R. A. Torrey on the Bible, and is presented on the popular level. A third of the book consists of practical suggestions with reference to Bible study; nevertheless, the prevailing emphasis is apologetic.

An Exposition of the Whole Bible. By G. Campbell Morgan. Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1959. pp. 542. $6.95.

Those who know G. Campbell Morgan as an expositor will be jubilant over the appearance of this volume. Never before published in America, it originally

was printed as a series in a small British paper, it is an exposition of every chapter in the Bible in the matchless Morgan manner. The essence of each chapter is distilled and the concentrate is powerful reading for those who approach it as a review of the Bible or as the springboard for sermon ideas.

Christology

Christ in the New Testament. By CHARLES M. LAYMON... Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958. pp. 256. $3.50.

In this book on Christology, Professor Laymon of Scarritt College uses the approach that is becoming popular in the study of the Gospels, viz., to determine the view of Christ that a particular author had. In the delineation of Christ in the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, the variety, yet more, the unity, of view is pointed out. This kind of approach is extremely rewarding. The book is written in an easily read style, and is quite usable.

The Cross

The Way of the Cross in Human Relations. By GUY FRANKLIN HERSHBERGER. Herald Press, 1958. pp. 424. $5.50.

In this work, Professor Hershberger of Goshen College brings to bear theology, ethics and responsibility upon such contemporary problems as labor relations and race relations. The perspective is that of the Mennonite point of view. A main characteristic of the book is the many practical applications that are given in illustrating the relevance of Christian ethics in contemporary society.

Missions

A Survey of World Missions. By JOHN CALDWELL THIESSEN. Chicago: The Inter-Varsity Press, 1956. pp. 504. $5.95.

The distinguished Professor of Missions at the Detroit Bible Institute has successfully undertaken the tremendous task of a comprehensive survey of world missions. Every part of the world, with the exception of North America, is covered. Each locale is discussed under the headings: The Land, The People, and The Religion. To assure accuracy, the individual sections were submitted by the author to expert missionaries in the respective areas for their appraisals. A bibliography is included for each section. At this time when interest in missionary activity in the church is growing, this volume will be helpful in planning an intelligent approach.

Christian Education

Christian Education of Adults. By EARL F. ZEIGLER. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958. pp. 142. $2.75.

Dr. Zeigler explains that adulthood is not a matter of years, but that it begins when life compels the individual to assume personal responsibility for his actions. Growing up, like learning, never ends, and this is the fact that directs the whole discussion. The author identifies three phases in the adult life span, he examines changing needs and interests, and shows how instructional appeals must modify with them.

A Study of Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}) (II)

Frank Pack

In the first part of this study the general description of P^{66} was given along with some preliminary considerations and statements made by textual scholars concerning its general textual complexion and the order of its materials as this sheds light on various theories of displacement in the Fourth Gospel. A survey of some of the interesting readings of this earliest "complete" manuscript of the gospel was begun which covered the first five chapters, and in this article the survey will be continued covering the remaining chapters of the book. The later chapters of the Fourth Gospel in P^{66} exist in more fragmentary form, but portions of all twenty-one chapters are preserved in the document. By comparison P^{45} (the Chester Beatty Papyrus) contains portions of John 10 and 11.

6:11. P^{66} adds the weight of its early authority to that of Aleph* A B W fam 1 565 it vg sy co in omitting *tois mathetais, hoi de mathetai* after *diedoken,* while the addition is read by D Theta fam 13 28 pm b e j and Textus Receptus. The RSV reading, ". . . he distributed them to those who were seated; so also the fish, as much as they wanted," is the reading of P^{66} against the King James version with the addition. Undoubtedly the addition here is an assimilation to the text of the feeding of the five thousand in Matthew 14:19 where Jesus is described as giving food first to the disciples and the disciples to the multitude seated.

6:51. Here is another passage where the reading of P^{66} points out the difference between the King James and the Revised versions (ASV, RSV) and supports the latter. It omits the addition *hen ego doso* along with Aleph B D W it vg sy cur sin, while the addition is read by Theta fam 1 fam 13 sy pesh bo and Textus Receptus. P^{66} adds to the correctness of the omission which was inserted as an explanatory gloss by later scribes in elaborating the text to clear some awkwardness.

6:55. P^{66} reads *alethes* both times in this verse with B W fam 1 fam 13 565 q co Cl Or attesting Alexandrian type reading against *alethos* read by Aleph* D Theta 28 it vg sy and Textus Receptus. Barrett holds strongly that preference should be given to *alethos* because of what he calls "Johannine usage."[1] Yet it is evident that the evangelist was not rigidly following a distinction between *alethinos* and *alethes* in his usages. C. H. Dodd points out that occasionally he uses *alethinos* in the sense of "veridical" and *alethes* in the sense of "genuine" or "real."[2] The weight of textual evidence is stronger for the reading of P^{66} at this point it would appear.

[1]C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956) pp. 134, 247.

6:58. In this verse the papyrus follows Aleph B C L W in rejecting the addition of *humon* after *hoi pateres.* The expression "the fathers" is found in 7:22 in Christ's words, while the expression "your fathers" is found in verse 49. Thus both expressions occur in the context of the book itself. P^{66} confirms the Alexandrian text here.

6:69. A number of variants are found in this passage, many of them showing the influence of Peter's confession as recorded in Matthew 16:16 and Mark 8:29, and possibly also reflecting early confessions used in the churches in the second century, and later. The principal variants are:

ho Hagios tou Theou—Aleph B C D L W

ho Christos—Tertullian

ho Christos ho Hagios tou Theou—P^{66} sa bo

ho Christos ho Huios tou Theou—Theta fam 1 33 565 a e vg sy sin

ho Christos ho Huios tou Theou tou zontos—E F G H N fam 13 28 pm ff^2 q r Cypr

ho Huios tou Theou—b sy cur

It is interesting to see that P^{66} has a reading which is followed by the Coptic versions of Egypt and represents a combination of the reading found in the Alexandrian texts with that of Terullian. It would appear that the Alexandrian texts have preserved the earliest form of this confession, and the reading of P^{66} represents a primitive adaptation through the insertion of *ho Christos* into it. This shows how soon certain conscious alterations can be made in a passage to make more specific some point which to later scribes has seemed somewhat vague.

7:4. P^{66} adds its testimony to B W* D* d in this verse by reading *auto* instead of *autos.* The masculine pronoun is read by the overwhelming majority of the manuscripts, but omitted by b e and possibly the sy cur although the latter is not certain. Barrett suggests that possibly John did not write a pronoun at all and the variants have been supplied in various ways, but the evidence for the omission is very slight.[3] Either variant will make sense in the passage, and both have strong evidence behind them. The context of the passage must determine whether the emphasis is on Jesus seeking to be known openly according to his brothers' thought. Could the reading of P^{66} all have come about through the slight alteration of the word to follow out some stylistic "improvement" which certain scribes felt the text demanded?

7:8. *ouk* is the reading of Aleph D it vg sy sin cur bo arm Chrys,

---

[2]C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955) p. 170.
[3]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

while *oupo* is read by P^{66} B W Theta fam 1 fam 13 sy pesh hl sa and Textus Receptus. *Ouk* is found in Nestle and in the ASV and RSV, probably upon the principle that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. While this is an important canon, it cannot be applied without regard to textual evidence and P^{66} has added powerfully to the weight of the reading *oupo*. Contextually a good case can be made for it, and textually it has better attestation than *ouk*. Here is one of the places where the textual affinities of P^{66} for Alexandrian and Caesarean readings are shown.

7:9. Instead of *autois* P^{66} reads the emphatic *autos* along with Aleph D* W fam 1 565 it vg co arm making the passage read as translated in the RSV, "So saying, he remained in Galilee."

7:12. Instead of the plural "among the multitudes" (*tois ochlois*) P^{66} reads the singular *to(i) ochlo(i)* along with Aleph D 33 it vg sy bo. The plural occurs only at this place in the Fourth Gospel and may be right, emphasizing the various groups with their conflicting opinions. It may be that the reading in P^{66} may represent an early attempt to bring this reading into conformity with other Johannine references to the multitude. If so, it is a very early attempt and must bear witness to such tendencies for stylistic corrections in the second century.

7:37-38. Several variants occur in this portion of the book to which P^{66} bears witness. Because this passage gave trouble to early Christians apparently, its text is somewhat confused in the manuscripts. After *erchestho* in verse 37 P^{66} along with Aleph* D b e vg(1) Cypr omit *pros me*, showing a reading of "Western" character. The second problem concerns the punctuation of 37b and 38. P^{66} agrees with WH in placing a stop after *pineto*, thus making the rivers of living water flow from the belly of the "one believing on me." Following certain Old Latin manuscripts a stop is placed after *pros me* and *kai pineto* is joined to the following expression to make a couplet, "If any man thirst let him come to me/ He that believeth on me, let him drink." Bultmann and W. F. Howard suggest following this arrangement, which would make Christ the one from whose belly the rivers of living water would come, but this arrangement rests upon the rather slight evidence of some Old Latin manuscripts and the Greek tradition is opposed to it. This couplet looks too artificial in form to have been the original arrangement of the passage. In verse 39 P^{66} follows B L W in reading *pisteusantes* instead of *pisteuontes* read by Aleph D Theta fam 1 fam 13 pm and Textus Receptus. The reading of P^{66} would have reference to the apostles themselves rather than to later believers in Christ. P^{66} reads *Pneuma* without the addition of *Hagion* in this verse along with Aleph Theta al co arm and confirms the reading of Westcott and Hort. B D W fam 1 fam 13 have the addition in one form or another, all bearing the evidence of conscious alteration in order to make the text clearer in this place.

7:52. P^{66} reads *egeiretai* with Aleph B D W Theta 565 it vg sy cur sin co against *egegertai* of E F G H fam 1 fam 13 and Textus Receptus. However, the most interesting variant in this verse is the insertion of the definite article *ho* before *prophetes* making the Jews affirm "the prophet does not arise out of Galilee" rather than "no prophet arises out of Galilee." This reading has been listed as a conjectured one in Nestle and Bultmann has mentioned it as a probability in his commentary but P^{66} gives the first manuscript evidence for its existence. J. Ramsey Michaels thinks it may be an original reading in this ancient manuscript but otherwise lost.[4]

7:53-8:11. The principal textual question of interest to a student of the Gospel of John is whether the pericope adulterae is included or omitted in the manuscript under study and if included under what forms. This famous passage is omimtted in P^{66} as it is from such ancient manuscripts as Aleph B W Theta 22 157 it sy sa Iren Or Tert Cypr, while inserted after Luke 21:38 by fam 13 and after John 7:36 by 225, after John 7:44 by some Georgian manuscripts and after John 21:24 by part of fam 1.[5] P^{66} shows no break in the manuscript, no spacing to show the scribe may have known of the existence of the pericope and hesitated to insert it.

8:25. This verse has been a problem for interpretation, turning on whether to regard it as a question or statement. The RSV has the reading, "Even what I told you from the beginning." The verse can be rendered as a question translating *hoti* as "why" thus, "Why do I speak to you at all?" Yet this fits in very poorly with the context. By supplying *ego eimi* Barrett suggests a rendering "I am from the beginning what I tell you."[6] P^{66} endeavors to clear up the awkward text by inserting *eipon humin* before *ten archen*, making the verse read, "I told you in the beginning what I tell you now." While Michaels feels that the original reading may be found here, it seems more likely that this is a clever insertion to make smooth an awkward passage, and make it fit into the context. At least this insertion of P^{66} makes more sense to this writer than Barrett's suggestion.

8:38. Instead of *ekousate* P^{66} reads *heorakate* with Aleph* D 28 pm it vg sy sin pesh hl sa and Textus Receptus, a "Western" reading that is obviously an assimilation to the first verb in the verse, *heoraka.*

8:39. In the conditional sentence P^{66} reads *este . . . poieite* with

---

[4]J. Ramsey Michaels, "Some Notable Readings of Papyrus Bodmer II," *Bible Translator* 8(1957) pp. 150-154.

[5]In recent issues of the *Restoration Quarterly* this passage has been fully discussed, both textually and from the standpoint of possible origins. See Earle McMillan, "Textual Authority for John 7:53-8:11" 3(1959) 18-22; Roy Bowen Ward, "The Case for John 7:53-8:11" 3(1959) 130-139; Fausto Salvoni, "Textual Authority for John 7:53-8:11" 4(1960) 11-15.

[6]Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

B* 700 ff[2] vg sy sin, which is in the correct form of a first class conditional sentence. This adds additional evidence to the text found in Westcott and Hort and Nestle. While Barrett strongly questions whether this is a correct reading, he did not have available the additional evidence of P^{66}, which seems decisive in this case.[7]

8:59. P^{66} has the shorter reading in this verse rejecting the addition to the end of the verse, "going through the midst of them, and so passed by," found in the King James Version. Reading with P^{66} are Aleph* B D W Theta* it vg sy sin, while the addition is read by Aleph^c A C Theta^c fam 1 fam 13 pl sy pesh hl. The addition shows harmonistic influence from Luke 4:30, where a similar experience occurred to Jesus.

9:4. Alpeh* L W join P^{66} in reading the plural pronoun *hemas* in both places in this verse, which is an Alexandrian reading. B D read *hemas . . . me* and the singular pronoun is used in both places by A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pm it vg sy. It would seem that the plural pronoun would offer the most difficult reading, while B and D may represent early efforts to soften the force of solidarity expressed by Jesus with his followers in the use of the plural. Here P^{66} seems to have called attention to the true reading.

9:11. P^{66} supports the best text in reading *ton Siloam* instead of *ten kolumbethran tou Siloam* read by Textus Receptus and A fam 13 28 pl it vg. Reading with P is Aleph B D W Theta fam 1 565 pc. The addition is a gloss that has been added evidently through assimilation with verse 7.

9:27. One of the interesting readings of this papyrus is the omission of the negative in *eipon humin ede kai ouk ekousate.* This omission is also followed by 22 e b c ff j l z sy sin vg and Tatian. According to this reading the blind man would say, "I told you already and you heard; why do you want to hear it again? Would you also be his disciples?" The evidence for this reading is very old and it may very well be the original reading here, as J. Ramsey Michaels thinks.[8] This would allow the ordinary meaning of *akouo* to be given the word here, rather than the derived meaning of "heed" which the negative demands for understanding the passage. However, the Fourth Gospel uses the verb *akouo* in both senses. If P^{66} has not brought back the original reading here, it has borne testimony to a very early conscious alteration in the text to solve an exegetical problem in an otherwise vague passage.

9:35. This manuscript confirms the reading "the Son of Man" found in Aleph B D W sy sin sa. This term is found 13 times in the Fourth Gospel and is the prefererd reading to "the Son of God" which is found in A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl it vg and Textus Receptus. The latter term is found in John 9 times.

---

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 287.
[8]Michaels, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-154.

10:4. The reading *ta idia panta* is supported by P^{66} B D L W fam 1 565 al it co against *ta idia probata* supported by A Theta fam 13 28 700 pm vg and Textus Receptus. Once more Papyrus Bodmer II is found giving the preferred reading, which is found in WH.

10:8. The first reading in which P^{66} may be compared with P^{45} (Chester Beatty Papyrus) for the Fourth Gospel finds these two early witnesses on opposite sides of the evidence. *Elthon pro emou* is read by P^{66} B D W fam 13 700 while *pro emou* is omitted by P^{45} apparently, although the reading is not certain due to the damaged papyrus, and by Aleph* 28 1424 it vg sy sin pesh sa. Theta fam 1 565 read *pro emou elthon*, changing the word order of P^{66}. Some interesting mixture of texts is evident in studying the variants and authorities for each one. P^{66} gives additional force to the recognition of the existence of several text-types side by side in the second century, all exerting influence upon one another. The concept of a "neutral" unmixed text must be abandoned in the face of increasing evidence to the contrary.

10:14. Here both P^{45} and P^{66} are found on the same side of the evidence in reading *ginoskousi me ta ema* ("mine own know me") with Aleph B D W it vg co. *Ginoskomai hupo ton emon* ("I am known by mine own") is found in A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl sy sin pesh hl and the Textus Receptus. Once more P^{66} confirms the reading found in the ASV and the RSV.

10:15. In the place of *tithemi* P^{66} joins P^{45} Aleph* D W in reading *didomi*, which may be an early correction. *Tithenai ten psuchen* is an expression peculiar to the Johannine writings. Yet the evidence for *didomi* is strong while the difference in essential meaning would be slight. Both verbs emphasize the willingness of Christ to offer his life for his own.

10:16. P^{66} has in the place of *agagein*, "bring," *sunagagein*, "gather," which is a reading found in no other manuscript known to scholars. This elaboration may have been used in the light of the context, feeling that it was more suitable to the shepherd "gathering" his sheep of this fold and the other sheep (Gentiles) to make one flock. Obviously it is a stylistic correction made in the interest of making more vivid the picture here. P^{66} also reads *genesetai*, "there shall be," with Aleph* A fam 13 28 pm sy and Textus Receptus against *genesontai*, "they shall be," with P^{45} B D W Theta 1 co arm. Here is another place where the antiquity of a reading found in the Textus Receptus is attested although the preferred reading is *genesontai.*

10:26. In addition to the order of materials in P^{66} a reading is given that indicates that the section from verses 1-18 must have preceded vv. 19-28. Moffatt proposed that vv. 19-28 should precede vv. 1-18 and in this arrangement he was followed by Bernard, Macgregor and others. To *emon* is added *kathos eipon humin*, "as I said to you," along with A D fam 1 fam 13 pm it and Textus Receptus.

Here is a "Western" type reading, probably an explanatory gloss, but giving early witness to the present order of materials in chapter 10. Here textual criticism makes a contribution to literary criticism in solving the problems of a document.

10:29. The textual picture in this verse is very confused as the following list will show:

to dedoken moi panton meizon (neuter)—B it vg bo

ho dedoken moi panton meizon (masc.)—Aleph W

hos dedoken moi meizon (masc.) *panton*—P^{66} fam 1 fam 13 al sy sa

hos dedoken moi meizon (neu.) *panton*—A Theta

ho dedokos moi panton meizon (masc.)—D

On this interesting list of variants, Barrett gives an extended discussion, coming to the conclusion that internal evidence favors the third in the above-listed alternatives, which is the reading of P^{66}. He rejects it, however, because he finds it impossible to decipher how the other variants derived from it if it were the original reading.[9] He conjectures that possibly John wrote the fourth reading above, which would make sense also and from this the other variants might have developed. However, it seems that the neuter *meizon* was influenced in these readings by *ho,* which is certainly awkward following "my Father" and out of keeping with the context as well. *Ho* may simply have been an ancient copyist error perpetuated with changes made in order to make sense of the passage. Since the reading of P^{66} gives the most likely solution on internal evidence, as well as bearing testimony to its antiquity, it seems best to accept this as the best reading. Even Barrett finds it impossible to explain the rise of all the variants here. This is true in a number of places in the Greek testament.

11:7. In this passage two readings occur in which P^{45} and P^{66} agree and display "Western" type readings. Instead of *epeita* P^{45} P^{66} D 435 have *eita. Tois mathetais* is omitted by P^{45} P^{66*} e 1*.

11:29. Again the two ancient papyri add their witness to the Textus Receptus by reading the verbs *egeiretai* and *erchetai* along with A Theta fam 1 fam 13 pm it vg against *egerthe* and *ercheto* read by Aleph B W it co. D divides its evidence reading *egerthe* and *erchetai,* which is obviously inconsistent. The additional evidence of P^{66} and P^{45} here is clear that these readings are very ancient and may very well be the original readings.

11:50. *Humin* instead of *hemin* is read by P^{45} P^{66} B D al it vg bo, while the pronoun is omitted by Aleph and a few other manuscripts. *Humin* is the preferred reading here.

12:17. P^{66} reads *hoti* instead of the more usual *hote* in this verse along with D L al it sy sin pesh, which would make the verse read, "The crowd that was with him was bearing witness that he called

[9]Barrett, *op. cit.,* p. 317.

Lazarus from the grave and raised him from the dead." *Hote* emphasizes the time when the crowds who witnessed the miracle bore their testimony, while *hoti* emphasizes the content of their testimony. *Hote* seems to be the better attested reading here.

12:25. The present indicative *appolluei* is read by P^{66} along with Aleph B W ff^2 instead of the future indicative *apolesei* given by A D Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl it vg and Textus Receptus. Probably the future *apolesei* is due to assimilation to the future *phulaksei* found in the last part of the verse. *Apolluei* is the preferred reading followed by Westcott and Hort and Nestle.

12:31. From the preferred reading *ekblethesetai ekso* P^{66} diverges in reading *blethesetai ekso* supported by D, giving evidence of a simplification of verb form in this context where the compound would not be needed. This is a "Western" reading showing conscious stylistic changes made in the text to "improve" the text. It may be that such "improvements" in "Western" texts may have had their sources oftentimes in Egypt as did such "improvements" in other text-types.

12:32. P^{66} exhibits an interesting variant which changes the meaning of this verse through the change of one letter. Along with Aleph* D it vg Aug P^{66} reads *panta* ("all things") instead of *pantas* ("all men") thus giving a cosmic application to the cross of Christ and his death. This is certainly true in Paul's writing. This is another "Western" type reading, which may evidence a dogmatic change for a larger scope to Christ's death, or may have come about through accidental omission.

12:47. Omitting the negative particle *me* before *phulakse(i)* along with D it, P^{66} makes the verse to read, "If any one hear my words and keep them, I do not judge him." Probably there is here the intentional omission of the negative particle in order to "clarify" a passage that may have presented some difficulty to readers in the second century, but this "Western" type reading is almost certainly wrong in the light of its context.

13:2. The aorist participle *genomenou*, used with *deipnou* meaning "supper being ended," is read by P^{66} A D $Aleph^c$ Theta fam 1 fam 13 33 pl it vg sa bo, giving a strong attestation. *Ginomenou*, used with *deipnou* meaning "during supper," is read by Aleph* B W pc d. The reading of P^{66} would make the feet-washing incident take place after the supper, while verse 26 would indicate that this was not the case. Perhaps the aorist participle reading occurred either through a scribal error in copying or by the assimilating effect of a passage that is filled with aorist verbs and participles.

13:5. P^{66} uses the word *podoniptera*, literally "a foot-basin," instead of the word *niptera*, "basin," in desribing what Jesus used to wash his disciples' feet. This is a reading unique to P^{66}.

13:10. P^{66} adds the reading *ei me tous podas*, "except the feet,"

along with B W (D). After this P^{66} adds *monon,* "alone," which is also added in slightly different form by D. Obviously this is an interpretative gloss and emphasizes the fact that such glosses are not necessarily late readings, but may reflect early changes.

14:4. Adding *kai ten hodon oidate* to the end of this verse is P^{66*} A D Theta fam 1 fam 13 pl it vg sy and Textus Receptus against Aleph B W ho. Doubtless this longer reading is given in order to make more simple a difficult passage, but this reading must be rejected as a later conscious effort to make the text more smooth and simple.

14:7. P^{66} reads *egnokate . . . gnosesthe* with Aleph D* W to give the sense of a promise, "If you have come to know me, as you have done, you shall know my Father also."[10] The reading found in B and followed by Westcott and Hort and Nestle Barrett points out has the elements of a reproach. P^{66} may have the correct reading here.

16:21. P^{66} follows D it sy sin pesh in reading *hemera* instead of *hora* in this verse, but the reading is a "Western" type that is certainly not the preferred reading. *Hora* is a Johannine term used constantly throughout the gospel for the time of Christ's glorification, and it fits perfectly into this context. *Hemera* may have been used to broaden the idea of the hour to include a larger scope than the scribes thought *hora* covered. This may be an indirect reference to the day referred to in vv. 23, 26.

17:14. P^{66} omits the words *kathos ego ouk eimi ek tou kosmou* along with D it sy sin as a "Western" omission. However, the clause has been inserted by a corrector's hand into P^{66}. Its omission may have been due to the feeling it was unnecessary repetition, although this is probably doubtful, or it may have been omitted unintentionally due to its similarity to the ending of verse 16.

18:13-24. This interesting section of the account of Jesus' trials which exists in transposed order in sy sin and in 225 is found in its regular order in P^{66}.

18:29. P^{66} omits *pros autous* after *ekso* along with Theta probably because this expression was felt unnecessary after *ekso,* although it may have been through a scribal error.

18:33. In this verse P^{66} and P^{52} the famous John Rylands fragment of the 18th chapter find themselves confirming the reading *palin eis to praitorion* along with B W fam 13 al it vg against the transposed order of Aleph A Theta fam 1 pm and Textus Receptus.

19:5. Does the reading of P^{66} in this verse display dogmatic bias? The expression "and he says to them, Behold, the man," is omitted by P^{66} a e ff^2 r^1. Could this have come about through the feeling that this saying seemed too derogatory to Christ, the Son of God? Or could it have come about through accidental oversight on the

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 383.

part of some scribe? These are intriguing questions which our present evidence will not enable solving. It appears that we are faced here with an instance of omission possibly through some sort of dogmatic bias on the part of the scribe that is not too clear to scholars today.

20:11. *Ekso* is omitted by P^{66} along with Aleph* A it sy as probably unnecessary in view of verse 12, although the burden of evidence is against the omission.

In this brief survey only a selection of the interesting variants of this ancient document has been noticed. P^{66} has shown itself in alliance oftentimes with the Alexandrian text-type represented in John by Aleph* B L W al and its readings add confirmation to the Westcott-Hort Nestle text tradition in the main. Yet it has shown the antiquity of many readings in the Textus Receptus and suggested some places when the Alexandrian text-type may not have been the original reading. It has produced a few very intriguing readings that are unusual in themselves. It has evidenced a number of so-called "Western" readings, showing this text-type present in Egypt in the second century. In these readings some of the processes of change can be seen as difficult passages are exegetically "clarified," rough linguistic expressions are "smoothed," and explanatory glosses at times come into the text, even though P^{66} does not evidence a great deal of this. How much of the variation has come about through conscious alteration is a great problem, but with P^{66} much additional insight is afforded textual scholars into what is happening in text transmission in the second century, the period of obscurity, and the period that has so profoundly influenced textual traditions of the Greek New Testament.

Abilene Christian College.

THE J. W. McGARVEY AWARD

In keeping with the announcement made previously, the *Restoration Quarterly* is repeating the award of $100 for the most distinctive article on a Biblical or a Biblically-related subject submitted during last year.

Two articels have received the same number of votes in the tabulation of the opinions of the members of the board. For this reason the award is again being divided. The winners are Don McGaughey for his article "The Function of Theology" and John McRay for his article "The Virgin Birth of Christ."

This year the award is being furnished by Abilene Christian College through the generosity of a friend who wishes to express appreciation for the work of the *Quarterly* and the young men who are dedicating themselves to educating themselves for scholarly study and at the same time honor Abilene Christian College for her many years

of devotion to the same ideal. This expression is sincerely and gratefully appreciated by all connected with the *Restoration Quarterly.*

We appreciate also all those who have submitted articles. The task of editing the journal would be much easier, if the many who are able to do the type of research and writing required for such a venture would find time to do so. The quality would be improved with a wider selection of material. Let us urge all to join in the effort.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY RECEIVES SCHOLARSHIP FOR STUDY IN HOLLAND

Abe Malherbe, the executive secretary of the *Restoration Quarterly,* has been recently awarded a $2,000 scholarship for post-graduate study by Abilene Christian College and will utilize it during the next school year to do the research for his dissertation in Holland.

The scholarship is made possible by a friend of the college who wishes thereby to honor the school for its devotion to Christian education and at the same time express appreciation and help to the young men in the church who are educating themselves for scholarly study and service to the church. The stipulations of the scholarship were that it should go to some young man who has made contributions to the *Restoration Quarterly* and who is still in the process of securing his education. The choice was left to a faculty committee at ACC.

Abe, in addition to being the executive secretary of the journal and having much to do with the start and on-going of the *Quarterly,* has made contributions of significant articles to its content. The committee was proud to recommend him for the award.

The recipient has completed his residence at Harvard and will be on a leave of absence from his place as preacher for the church in Lexington, Mass. He will study under Dr. van Unnick and Dr. Quispel at Utrecht. He will be working in the field of Gnosticism and will be interested especially in the recently announced documents of Nag Hammadi. Abe and Phyllis and their daughter Selina will leave for Europe late in the summer.

PERSONALIA

Frank Pack is Professor of Bible and Christian Education at Abilene Christian College.

John McRay is a teacher of Bible at Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas.

James D. Bales is also a Professor of Bible at Harding College.

Thomas N. Schulz is a graduate student at Abilene Christian College.

Some Aspects of Conditional Sentences In the Greek New Testament

J. W. Roberts

The great Gildersleeve once said that conditional sentences constitute one of the most important phenomena of Greek Syntax.[1]

Shakespeare had one of his characters say that "if" is a "peacemaker" and that there is much virtue in "if."[2] If virtue here means importance, one is inclined to agree. But Shakespeare, when he said that the word "if" is a peacemaker, did not anticipate the involved controversy between Greek grammarians of the nineteenth century over the word.

The New Testament, like other collections of Greek documents, makes frequent use of suppositional statements. There are, according to this writer's count, 339 examples of complete periods using *ei* and the indicative in what are called "conditions of reality," 51 using *ei* and the indicative in "contrary to fact" conditions, 332 using *ean* and the subjunctive in "anticipatory" conditions, and 12 examples of *ei* and the optative in the New Testament (though the latter are not all true conditions, nor are they complete conditional sentences). This maks a total of 774 or an average of about 1.2 per page in a late edition of Nestle's Greek text. Considering the fact that there are an even larger number of mixed conditions and quasi-conditionals or conditional equivalents such as participles and indefinite relatives which behave like conditionals and must be so interpreted, one can see how large this construction looms in the Bible. The construction is also important exegetically because Greek sentences express their shades of meaning oftentimes more precisely than their English counterparts.

This paper will offer a survey of the results of a more detailed study of conditional sentences in the New Testament. The original investigation was entitled "The Use of Conditional Sentences in the Greek New Testament as Compared with Homeric, Classical, and Hellenistic Uses."[3] The study was made comparatively because of the conviction that the Koiné (of which the N. T. is a part) must be studied from the larger context of the historical language and also because the voluminous controversy against which these sentences must be interpreted involves the longer history of their use in the language.

The temperatment of the nineteenth century seemingly was more conducive to purely grammatical study than our own. The older

[1]B. L. Gildersleeve, "Studies in Pindaric Syntax. 1. Conditional Sentences," *The American Journal of Philology*, III (1882), 434-45.
[2]*As You Like It*, Act V, Scene IV.
[3]J. W. Roberts. Unpublished Dissertation (University of Texas Library, 1955).

masters of the classics like Goodwin, Gildersleeve, and Sonnenschein gave minute attention to the study of the language. The results appear in the great works like Goodwin's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*,[4] Gildersleeve's articles in the *American Journal of Philology* and the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, in the descriptive grammars like that of Smyth,[5] and of Goodwin-Gulick[6] and others.

The conclusions set forth in recent New Testament grammars such as Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*,[7] H. P. V. Nunn's *Syntax of New Testament Greek*,[8] both the large and short grammars of A. T. Robertson,[9] Dana and Mantey's *Manual of the Greek New Testament*,[10] and Blass-Debrunner's *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[11] reflect one side or the other of the discussions carried on between the classical scholars in a hated debate among English and American grammarians in the last quarter of the 19th century.

That debate concerned the best scheme of classifying and describing conditional sentences and what the actual meaning of some of them is.

The background of the discussion lies in the fact that there are several ways to classify conditionals. It is possible to classify as to form (either of the protasis or of the adodosis (the protasis with *ei* or *ean*, the apodosis with or without *an*), or as to time (whether the condition is past, present, or future), as to whether the condition is particular (speaking of the specific action of some person or persons) or is general (speaking indefinitely of any act of a given class which may be supposed to occur), or finally as to the meaning (whether the condition implies the determination or non-determination, the fulfillment or non-fulfillment, anticipation or vividness of the condition).

All grammarians admitted that it is not so much a matter of one system being wrong or right as it is a question as to which classification best summarizes the different classes of sentences or

---

[4]William Watson Goodwin. (Rewritten and Enlarged. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1930).

[5]Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York: American Cook Co., 1920).

[6]William Watson Goodwin and Charles Burton Gulick. *Greek Grammar* (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1930).

[7]Ernest De Witt Burton. (Fifth Edition. Chicago University of Chicago, 1903).

[8](Cambridge, U. Press, 1938).

[9]*A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* Fourth Edition (Nashville, Boardman Press, 1934); *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, with W. Hersey Davis (New York, Harper, 1931).

[10](New York, Macmillan Co., 1943).

[11](Achte Auflage. Goettingen, Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1949).

which will aid the student to grasp the significance of the types and make them his own. However there was serious disagreement as to the exact significance of some forms.

E. A. Sonnenschein, an English grammarian, preferred a system of classification based solely on form.[12] But he found little following in his idea in this country.

Goodwin's Classification. The system of classification best known to the American students is that of Goodwin, which combines several features mentioned above. His four main divisions are:

I. Present and Past Suppositions Implying Nothing as to the Truth or Untruth of the Protasis.
   A. Chiefly Particular, *ei* and the Indicative.
   B. General.
      1. Present General, *ean* and the Subjunctive—Present Indicative.
      2. Past General, *ei* with the Optative—Imperfect Indicative.

II. Present and Past Particular Implying that the Protasis is not True and that the Condition is not Fulfilled (Contrary to Fact).

III. Future More Vivid Conditions, *Ean* with the Subjunctive, usually with the Future Indicative.

IV. Future Less Vivid Conditions, *ei* with the Optative, optative with *av*.

In addition to Goodwin's grammars (including the revision by Gulick) this is basically the system in Smyth's *Greek Grammar* and also that of the N. T. grammars by Burton and by Nunn.

But this system (though adopted by these grammars) was violently attacked in the last century as being unscientific and untrue to the real meaning of the Greek constructions. The frontal attack was made by B. S. Gildersleeve (of Johns Hopkins). He objected, for example, to making the distinction between general and particular sentences the chief norm. He demonstrated that all types of protases may be general (not just those using *ean* and the subj. with a present tense in the apodosis, which Goodwin called "present general," and those using *ei* and the optative with the imperfect in the apodosis, which Goodwin called "past general) and that all types are usually general when they contain the indefinte *tis* ("anyone"). Next he objected to making time the second major classification basis because it left no place for particular or general future conditions using *ei* with the future indicative (which Gildersleeve called mina-

[12]A. Sonnenschein, "Horton Smith's *Conditional Sentences*," *Classical Review*, IX (1895), 220-223. He was supported by C. D. Chambers, "The Classification of Conditional Sentences," *Ibid.*, IX (1895), pp. 293ff.

tory and monitory because they often expressed threats or warnings.)[13]

Gildersleeve further objected (as did many others) to the assertion of Goodwin that the first class condition does not "imply anything as to the truth or untruth of the protasis." He argued that when it is undersood that all use of mood has to do with the *manner of affirmation,* that is, with the *statement* of fact or uncertainty and not fact or uncertainty itself (which must always be determined from context or prior knowledge) that it will be then understood that the protasis of the first class condition does state its hypothesis as a fact or reality from which the apodosis naturally follows. Furthermore, it was argued that the term "vividness" in the expressions "more vivid" and "less vivid" does not represent the true distinction between the *ean* and the subj. and *ei* and the optative in these two types of future conditions. The large majority of American and British grammarians argued that the former expressed "anticipation" while the latter expressed "possibility" or a lesser degree of "probability" rather than vividness.

Gildersleeve preferred the division of all conditions on the basis of whether the protasis is determined or undetermined, subdividing the determined into those determined as true (which he called "logical") and those determined as untrue (which he called "unreal") and subdividing the undetermined in the "probable" (which he called the "anticipatory") and the "less probable" (which he called the "ideal"). He pointed out that each of these four types of protases could be either general or particular and that the time falls naturally into the pattern of meanings, the logical being past, present, or future; the unreal being by its meaning limited to past and present; the anticipatory being either present (fact uncertain) or future; and the ideal being future except for those put in the past by the use of the imperfect indicative in the apodosis.[14]

This system goes back to the analysis of the German grammarian Hermann, according to A. T. Robertson. It is the system adopted by Robertson in both his large and short grammars and by the grammars like Dana and Mantey and W. H. Davis which depend upon Robertson's work. Those interested will find the section on conditional sentences in Robertson's *Historical Grammar* one of the more

---

[13]Besides the references given above, compare Gildersleeve, "Reviews and Book Notices," *AJP,* IX (1888), 491-92; "On *ei* with the Future Indicative and *Ean* with the Subjunctive in the Tragic Poets," *TAPA,* VII (1876), 2-23; "Brief Mention," *AJP,* XXXIII (1912), 490. See also E. B. Clapp, "Conditional Sentences in Aischylas," *TAPA,* XVIII (1887), 48-53 and "Conditional Sentences in the Greek Tragedians," *Ibid.* (1911), 8--92.

[14]For Goodwin's reply to criticism of his analysis see "On the Classification of Conditional Sentences in Greek Syntax," *TAPA,* IV (1873), 60-79 and "On 'Shall' and 'Should' in the Protasis, and Their Greek Equivalents," *Ibid.,* VII (1876), 87-107.

able sections of the book. He vigorously defends the fourfold system basic to Gildersleeve's treatment, but claims to have arrived at the conclusions through his teachers independently of Gildersleeve's work. His analysis is marred only by some confusion over the optative mood as discussed below.

A fairly recent article by W. Kendrick Pritchett[15] in the *American Journal of Philology* laments that this analysis of conditionals of Gildersleeve which once found acceptance in respectable quarters is now generally neglected and that the analysis of Goodwin is taught to most classics students.

Mr. Pritchett largely replies in his article to a work by Miss E. A. Hahn entitled *The Subjunctive and the Optative* (N. Y., 1953) in which she had re-examined and restated the position of Goodwin. He argues against the view of Goodwin that the optative condition is merely a "less vivid" form of the future condition. He further argues that Goodwin's limitation of general conditions to two types is confusing and cites Goodwin's admission in Liddell and Scott (7th Ed.) that he had made too extensive application of this principle.

The study of N. T. conditions reveals interesting facts only a few of which can be given in the limits of this paper. New Testament usage conforms generally to the same basic types and the same constructions within those types as the Attic dialect, the dialect in which the earlier variety became more fixed and the dialect which served as the basis of the Koiné structure. N. T. variations from classical usage are either to be accounted for in origin by the LXX or the papyri or the Koiné in general.

The princpal differences in N. T. usage are:

(1) Use (though infrequent) of forms not considered standard in the Classical language: *ei* and the subjunctive (some 7 times in the N. T.), *ean* with the indicative (some twelve possible examples, texts uncertain), and *ean* instead of *an* in indefinite or conditional relatives (this last rather frequent). All these occasionally are found in the Classical language just as in the N. T. The frequency is about on a par with the LXX and Papyri.

(2) The use of *ou* instead of *me* ("not") as a usual negative of the logical or first class conditional. This is a major change from Classical, though again in line with the use in the Koiné generally. In participles the Classical usage, whereby the conditional participle takes *me* and the others *ou*, no longer is the rule, *me* greatly predominating as negative with all types of participles.

(3) The N. T. has a few examples (mostly in quotations, but see Mark 8:12) of the use of *ei* with the future indicative to express an oath (Cf. Heb. 6:14). This construction is seemingly unique in

---

[15]W. Kendrick Pritchett, "The Conditional Sentence in the Greek," *AJP* LXXII (1955), pp. 1-17.

Biblical Greek, having originated in the LXX where there are some 74 examples of it.

(4) The major variations in the N. T. of conditions is in the loss or infrequency of use of certain forms:

(A) *Ei* with the future indicative (other than in oaths) is sparingly used in the N. T. (There are only some twenty examples.) Only one of these (2 Tim. 2:12) has the minatory-monitory force observed by Gildersleeve in its Classical usage (especially in the Tragic Poets). So the generalization has little meaning for the N. T. This construction was found to be quite common in Attic.

(B) The unreal condition is comparatively infrequent in the N. T., there being only 51 occurrences as compared with over 300 for real and anticipatory conditions. The Gospel of John has 18 of these. This lack of use does not seem to be due to any process of decay, but merely to the accident of use. The imperfect here usually places the time of the condition in the present, though it may have the past continuous meaning. Some 14 exampels of this condition occur where the context shows the condition to be unreal, but where the particle *an* (the usual sign) does not occur in the apodosis. However this state of affairs is not uncommon in other Greek. The potential indicative is used in the N. T. much as in Classical Greek.

(C) The Ideal Condition (in line with the general loss of the Optative in the Koiné) does not occur in the N. T. in complete form. There are 12 uses of *ei* with the optative in the N. T. Of these only 1 Peter 3:14, 17; 1 Cor. 14:10 and 15:37 probably belong to the ideal condition. The others (Acts 17:11; 27 *bis*; 20:16; 24:19; 25:20; 27: 12, 39) seem to be uses of Logical or Anticipatory Conditions turned into *ei* with the optative in indirect discourse. (This is a Classical usage; not that all instances are found in Luke.) Several commentators (Lenski, for example) take A. T. Robertson severely to task for calling passages like Acts 17:11, 27 fourth class conditions instead of recognizing them as indirect discourse. As in Attic Greek the optative with *an* in a potential sense occurs some nine times in the N. T.; these are significant mostly as relics of the former style. The complete Ideal Condition seemingly is replaced in the N. T. by the Real or Anticipatory conditions. The "past general" type (which many grammarians consider a mixed condition anyway) does not occur.

As to the controversy over the meaning and classification of conditional sentences, the following should be noted:

(1) The Logical or First Class Conditions which Goodwin-Gulick call "past or present particular" conditions are not by any means wholly or even mostly particular in the N. T. Many of this type are general. This fact has generally been recognized by N. T. grammarians (Moulton, *Introduction,* p. 210; Burton, p. 107). Examples are 1 Cor. 15:32; Luke 14:26; Rom. 8:25; James 1:26; Rev. 11:5; Luke 19:8. On this point the N. T. evidence supports the objection of Gildersleeve and his followers to Goodwin's scheme.

(2) In the N. T. (contrary to the statement of most grammars) the third class ("Future More Vivid") does not usually have the future tense in the apodosis. The most frequent construction in the apodosis is the present indicative (111 to 105). Of course, other constructions like the imperative (24), *ou me* with the Aor. Subj. (26), add strength to the assertion that the future idea is the logical apodosis for use with *ean* and the subj. It is the apodosis with the present tense which most interests us. The N. T. examples do include some of the type meaning, "If he ever does this, he is always punished" (Goodwin's Present General). But this by no means exhausts the meaning of the construction. As some N. T. grammars have noted, *ean* with the subj. with the present indicative often has a future sense or the sense of something now true and thought of as enduring or continuous. The idea need not be general. See Matt. 18:13; 2 Cor. 5:1. The future is often so real that it is spoken of as being vividly present. Many conditions of this type are not general. What, for example, is general about John 19:12, "If you should loose this man, you are no friend of Caesar"? or about Matt. 8:2 "If you wish, you can heal me"? It is possible to think of these as mixed conditions. But they are really very common. The truth is that Goodwin's classification has no place for such conditions.

The N. T. evidence, then, seems to support the contention of Gildersleeve and Pritchett (1) that all four types of protases are either particular or general according to subject and context and hence it is a mistake to isolate two of these general types and give them special classes while the others are ignored and (2) that, since the Logical or First Class condition may also be future, it is illogical to make time a major basis of classification.

There are too few Ideal fragments in the N. T. to throw any light on the further controversy over the terms "more" or "less vivid" as a means of expressing the difference between the 3rd and 4th class supposition in Goodwin's classification. My own study of the relevant literature and analysis of the sentences in a wide range of authors from Homer down has led me to think that here also Goodwin's terminology is not the best.

The discussion as to whether the First Class Conditional protasis states the assumption as fact cannot in this writer's opinion be settled by an appeal to examples; so the N. T. evidence helps but little. Good grammarians may be found on both sides of the question. It really seems to be merely a matter of viewpoint. Burton claims that it is the context which shows whether the statement is actually true or false. Others point out that even the contrary-to-fact statements may be shown by the context not to be untrue. It seems to this writer that Robertson is right that such discussion confuses *fact* with *statement of fact* and that mood does have to do with the statement of the verb as to reality or non-reality. Many N. T. examples are "statements for sake of argument" (Matt. 12:28) or premises in *ad hominem* arguments. Many others are the type used when

one accepts a fact just uttered at face value which had not previously been understood, as when the Pharisees said to John the Baptist, "If you are not the Christ" (as John had just denied), "then why do you baptize?"

In summary, the review of the whole study and examination of N. T. conditions has led this writer to think that the simple four-class division of Gildersleeve is much to be preferred to that of Goodwin and to agree with Mr. Pritchett in lamenting that Gildersleeve's classification has not met with wider adoption.

John the Baptist and The Dead Sea Scrolls

John McRay

The dates of the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Wadi Qumran[1] are of some importance in a discussion of their relevance to John the Baptist who lived in the first century A.D.[2] Burrows feels the "battle of the scrolls" has been settled and the dates range from 100 B. C. to 70 A.D.[3] In his judgment "the views first advanced on the basis of paleography still hold the field, even though at one point or another the lines may have to be rectified."[4] Gaster feels that 170 B.C. to 68 A.D. would best represent the period of writing.[5] On the basis of paleography Birnbaum argues for a first-half of first century B.C. date for $_1$QpHab.[6]

Since the Scrolls were first brought to light Solomon Zeitlin has been charging the scholarly world at large with "fraud" and "pseudo-scholarship."[7] He feels that a medieval date is necessary for all the literature. Zeitlin stands pretty much alone in this opinion however. Albright feels that a pre-Christian date for the earliest and a date before 70 A.D. for the latest would be acceptable.[8] Thus the majority of the Scrolls which have to do with our subject can be placed in a period of history somewhat contemporary with John the Baptist.

Since there is no factual evidence in the Scrolls to which one might appeal for definite *proof* of contact between John and the Qumran community it will be necessary to review the Biblical material preserved about him and make necessary assumptions and deductions from that. It is interesting in this regard to note a statement from one of the best critical works on John the Baptist that has been done in recent times.

---

[1]Those found in the Wadi Murabaat area date about 135 A.D. and those in the Khirbet Mird area in the Byzantine period, about 400-500 A.D. See further J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959), p. 19. J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Pelican Books), n.d., Appendix III.

[2]Luke 3:1 gives the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar as the beginning date of John's ministry. This would be about 29 A.D.

[3]Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: The Viking Press, 1957), p. 344. One should keep in mind the date of publication.

[4]*Ibid.*

[5]Theodor Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956), p. v of Preface.

[6]Solomon A. Birnbaum, *The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Paleography, BASOR*, Supplementary Studies 13-14 (Oct., 1952).

[7]Solomon Zeitlin, "A Commentary on the Book of Habbakuk: Important Discovery or Hoax?", *JQR*, XXXIX (Jan., 1949), p. 235. "More Literature on the Dead Sse Scrolls—More Pseudo-Scholarship," *JQR*, XLIX (March, 1959), 221-238.

[8]W. F. Albright, "Editorial Announcement," *BASOR* (Oct., 1952), p. 2.

To obtain a valid and vivid picture of the Baptist what we need is not more new evidence but a better understanding of the way to read the available New Testament sources.[9]

The questions that arise about John and his possible relation to the Qumran community are many. What was his background in the light of the "wilderness" references? May he still be considered a "man from God" to whom "the Word of God came" and have been influenced by the Qumran community or Judaism in general? How does his teaching and manner of life relate to that of the Qumran group? As a total picture what do the Dead Sea Scrolls contribute to our knowledge of this remarkable second-Elijah? And it is a much debated question as to whether John may furnish a connecting link between the Qumran community and the canonical Gospel of John.[10]

II

The Wilderness Situation

Luke 1:80 states that John was "in the wilderness till the day of his showing unto Israel." Matthew 3:1 adds "And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea . . ." After the excavation of the Qumran community on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea[11] these passages called forth a renewed study among scholars having found reason to believe that John may have been associated with the group. The monastery is located in the "Wilderness of Judea" where John preached.[12]

The Wilderness of Judea is one of four geographical divisions of Palestine (i.e. the Southern part of the "Hill Country" which is one of four divisions) located directly west of the Dead Sea, and it has been described as "a barren, rugged wasteland, cut by numerous deep and jagged valleys leading down to the Dead Sea."[13] It seems that none of this area south of Jerusalem with the exception of Bethlehem played any part in the New Testament story.[14] The area northeast

---

[9]Carl H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 6. Although the substance of this book was given in lecture form in 1946—one year before the discovery of the Scrolls—it was published in 1951 after considerable study had been done on some of the Scrolls. (cf. *Biblical Archaeologist* XIII, Sept. 1950, no. 3; and other issues of 1950-51). The author apparently did not wish to correct any statement in the manuscript. This should be remembered when the book is referred to, in later comments.

[10]Lucretta Mowry, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John," *BA*, XVII (Dec. 1954).

[11]J. M. Allegro, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958); F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958), p. xvi.

[12]Kraeling, however, feels John wouldn't have baptized in this region. *John the Baptist*, p. 8.

[13]G. E. Wright & F. V. Filson, *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1945), p. 65. See picture on p. 63.

[14]See discussion *Ibid.*, p. 19a, 58b. Also see M. F. Unger, *Unger's Bible Dictionary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1957), p. 484.

of Jerusalem, however, is now known to have been one of considerable activity.[15]

The Dead Sea Scrolls furnish us with some evidence now for a serious consideration of possible contact between John the Baptist and the Qumran community. Their use of Isaiah 40:3 to justify their departure into the desert[16] for example, is of some importance.

> When these men exist in Israel, these are the provisions whereby they are to be kept apart from any consort with froward men, to the end that they may indeed "go into the wilderness to prepare the way," i.e., do what Scripture enjoins when it says, "Prepare in the wilderness the way . . . make straight in the desert a highway for our God."[17]

John appealed to the same passage as justification for his work.[18]

However, although the Qumran group *did* use Isaiah a great deal[19] one must remember that the use of a book by two separate groups does not establish a relationship one with the other—merely a mutual dependence upon the book. The book of Isaiah was familiar to both the Dead Sea group and John the Baptist and, as Burrows has observed, one would logically expect to find some similarities.[20] They both reflect the same general background. One need not say, however, that "nothing developed in Christianity which had not its roots in Judaism of the first and second century B.C."[21] in order to make this observation. There was a fundamental difference in the application of the passage by the Qumran sect on the one hand and by John on the other. The sect applied the passage to *themselves* and were preparing only themselves for the Messiah's coming. John, quite to the contrary, was preparing *others* for His advent.

And before one becomes too rabid in identifying John with the Qumran group on the basis of Isaiah 40:3 he should remember that John was probably aware of the events that took place at the announcement of his birth. In both the words of the angel and those of Zechariah there are direct allusions to the passage.[22] From John's

---

[15]A readable source on the wilderness situation is J. Steinmann, *St. John the Baptist & the Desert Tradition* (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1958).

[16]The word in Matt. 3:1 is *eremos* and means properly an "abandoned, empty, desolate" area. Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, p. 308.

[17]1QS viii. 14 cf. also ix. 19f. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, pp. 56, 59. Del Medico feels this (viii. 7-16) may be an extract from a commentary on Isaiah to explain the coming of John the Bap. M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (N.Y.: The Viking Press, 1958), p. 63.

[18]Luke 3:3-6.

[19]There are 71 references to Isaiah in Gaster's translation (see note 5 above), pp. 345-346. S. V. McCasland feels that the prophet Isaiah and particularly 40:3 was the favorite of Qumran. "The Way," *JBL, LXXVII* (Sept. 1958), pp. 222-230.

[20]Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 337.

[21]A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, & Co., 1954) p. 166, quoting Renan.

[22]Luke 1:17; Luke 1:76.

birth then, there would be deeply imbedded in his mind his relation to this passage from Isaiah. Then too, one may find that the angel's charge that John would "go before his face in the spirit and power of Elijah" (Luke 1:17) could have had sufficient impact to send John into the wilderness before the "Word of God came unto" him (Luke 3:2).

As to John's asceticism the words of Steinmann are provocative of much thought: "Desert life is necessarily ascetic. It often imposes involuntary fasting and solitude which frequently means celibacy."[23] While it is true that one of the documents closely connected with the Dead Sea Scrolls[24] (CDC xii. 14f.)[25] permits the eating of locusts as a clean food—if boiled or roasted—it is not a customary diet for the Qumran group as it seems to have been for John at that time. It would be difficult to demonstrate that John ate the food after he left the "Wilderness of Judea" and located in Bethany beyond the Jordan (John 1:28) and Aenon near to Salim (John 3:23). Perhaps the desert situation itself caused his asceticism or possibly it was self-dedication to God. Bruce's comment on this matter is of some interest.

> Of course, if one were writing historical fiction it would be possible to explain that John had been excommunicated from the group, and in view of his stringent vows taken at initiation, was prevented from eating any other kind of food.[26]

There is no doubt as to the stringency of the initiatory vows[27] and the situation Bruce describes may one day reveal itself as more than "historical fiction." John may have been reared an orphan by the Qumran covenanters.[28] J. van der Ploeg, however, feels it is "going beyond the evidence" to assert that he grew up at Qumran.[29] A. B. Bruce would say that Luke 1:80 *may* mean simply that John frequented the deserts as a lad and yet remained at home with his parents.[30] The opinions are as varied as multiple.

The facts of John's life can be simply stated. He was "in the

---

[23]Steinmann, *Saint John the Baptist,* p. 159.

[24]Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* p. 348.

[25]Translated in Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* p. 361.

[26]F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapirs: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1956), p. 140.

[27]1QS v. 7-20. p. 47 Gaster. cf. Essenes of Josephus, "The Jewish War," II viii. 7 *The Loeb Classical Series,* trans. H. St. J. Thackery (London: Hienemann Ltd., 1956) II, p. 375, 6.

[28]Allegro, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* p. 164. C. T. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community* (N.Y.: Macmillan Co., 1956), p. 112. Both feel it would explain his appearance in the wilderness. W. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament,* ed. Krister Stendahl (N.Y.: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 35.

[29]J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958), p. 80.

[30]A. B. Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels," *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), I, 470.

wilderness till the time of his showing to Israel" (Luke 1:80). He emerged "preaching in the wilderness of Judea" (Matt. 3:1). He preached in the "region round about the Jordan" (Luke 3:3). Jesus said of him: "What went you out in the wilderness to see?" (Matt. 11:7). He came "neither eating nor drinking" (Matt. 11:18). He appealed to Isaiah 40:3 (Luke 3:4-6).

With these facts at hand (both from the New Testament and Qumran) one might reason that since his parents were quite old at his birth (Luke 1:7), John like Samuel was consecrated to God through the Qumran priesthood[31] at their death—and this is feasible in light of the antagonism that existed between the priesthood of Qumran and that of Jerusalem[32]—*if* his father had made a break with the Jerusalem priests.[33] Howie points out that Zechariah was probably a rural priest.[34] If so, a disagreement with the urban priests would not have been unthinkable.

On the other hand one might assume that John was still devoted to the priesthood of his father[35] but left it in later life and went into the wilderness for some reason.

The Dead Sea Scrolls do not furnish us with information upon which to make conclusive judgments as yet (though one wonders what wealth of information lies in the thousands of fragments yet to be identified and the many Scrolls that undoubtedly are now lying in some unknown *genizah*). However, there *is* more room for consideration now of a childhood in the "Wilderness of Judea" with the uncovering of the Dead Sea Monastery in that region, and it should be remembmered that there was a group of people living in that exact region at that time who preached a similar message.[36]

III

John, Qumran, and the Essenes

The case for John's relationship to the community at Qumran has

---

[31]Cf. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community*, p. 113. Brownlee, note 18 above.

[32]Commentary on Micah, Gaster, *Dear Sea Scriptures*, p. 239.

[33]See Allegro's discussion of the dificulties over dates of the Jewish Calendar in *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 31.

[34]Carl G. Howie, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Living Church* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958), p. 45. So also Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, p. 23.

[35]Burrows feels that Zecharias had not seceded: *More Light*, p. 57. Kraeling suggests that John left the Jerusalem priesthood and was rejected in his home community for having done so. He then fled to the wilderness. *John the Baptist*, pp. 26-27.

[36]On the location of the Dead Sea group compare Pliny's interesting testimony to the Essenes in *Historica Naturalis*, v. 17 "The Essenes live on the west side away from the shores (of the Dead Sea) . . ." Cited in A. Powell Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (N.Y.: The New American Library: A Mentor Book, 1956), Appendix. This paperback has several appendices of such source material.

been largely based on a supposed similarity of teaching. It is interesting to observe that this has been done on the assumption that the Qumran group is the sect of Essenes described by Josephus, Pliny, and Philo, and the opinion is widespread among scholars.[37] It is Essene teaching more often that is compared to John's than that of the Qumran groups as actually represented in the Dead Sea Literature, and Zeitlin still denies that Qumran was Essene at any point.[38]

It will be necessary, therefore, to notice that similarities between the Essenes and the group which lived on the shores of the Dead Sea do exist and are striking. In each group a minimum of ten persons was required to constitute a congregation.[39] An oath of initiation was required by both sects.[40] Dining, worship, and counseling were carried on as a group in both.[41] There were priests in both of the sects.[42] Strict obedience to elders was required in both.[43] A three year novitiate characterized admission requirements for both sects.[44] A deep regard for study is to be found in the literature of both Qumran and the Essenes.[45] Strict punitive measures for lying were included in the rules of both.[46] The novice had no stake in the common fund for the first year.[47] Expulsion for certain offenses is a penalty of both groups.[48] Both sects had officers in their communi-

---

[37]Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light from Ancient Scrolls," p. 35. Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 294. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 164; *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 25, 48. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community*, p. 110. S. E. Johnson, *Jesus in His Homeland* (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), p. 27. Howie, *Scrolls & the Living Church*, p. 51. W. S. LaSor, *Amazing D. S. Scrolls and the Christian Faith* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), pp. 206, 237. Steinmann, *St. John the Baptist*, pp. 58, 60. H. H. Rowley, *The D. S. Scrolls & the New Testament* (London: S.P.C.K., 1960), pp. 3-4. He speaks of Qumran as an "earlier stage" in the history of the Essenes. Gaster, *Dead Sea Scriptures*, p. v of Preface. Gaster says "The Scrolls were conserved in the Library of an Essene Monastry or meeting-house at Qumran but represent the religious repertoire of the Essene Brotherhood as a whole." J. van de Ploeg, *Excavations*, pp. 49-51. He speaks of Qumran as a "category of Essenes." Dupont-Sommer, *Jewish Sect*, p. 150. D-Sommer calls the community "Quasi-Essene."

[38]Zeitlin, "Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JQR*, XLVII (Oct. 1956), p. 197.

[39]1QS vi. 1-8; Josephus, *War* II, viii. 5.

[40]LQS v. 7-20; *War* II, viii. 6.

[41]1QS vi. 1-8; *War* II, viii. 5.

[42]1QS vi. 1-8; *War* II, viii. 5.

[43]1QS vi. 1-8; *War* II, viii. 6.

[44]1QS vi. 1-8; *War* II, viii. 7, 10.

[45]1QS vi. 8; *War* II, viii. 6.

[46]1QS vi. 23-24; *War* II, viii. 7, 3.

[47]1QS vi. 13-23; *War* II, viii. 7.

[48]1QS vii. 18-25; *War* II, viii. 8.

[49]1QS viii. 1-19; *War* II, viii. 4.

ties.[49] Others we must compare in some detail, as they relate to the teaching of John the Baptist. Burrows feels that Josephus *was* possibly speaking of the Qumran community in his references to a sect of Essenes who permitted marriage and that it is "thoroughly possible, even probable" that Qumran is the group to whom Pliny referred in his discussion of the Essenes.[50]

Steinmann believes the second group of Josephus (i.e. those permitting marriage) to be a former stage in the progress of Essenism as does Rowley.[51] It is true that our oldest source, Pliny (about 20 A.D.), makes no mention of celibacy.[52] It seems quite probable that the Qumran community, then *may* be the second group of Essenes mentioned in Josephus. This view is strengthened by the fact that skeletons of women and children have been excavated from Qumran.[53] While one could not be dogmatic of course, the likelihood of this identification cannot be easily denied. If it be objected that the *doctrine* of the "Essenes" is so much different than that of Qumran, one must remember that our three principal sources do not discuss the doctrine of the marrying sect (the "other order") of Essenes. Dupont-Sommer's suggestion, then, that Qumran may well have been a "quasi-Essene" group is worthy of consideration.[54]

One question frequently discussed by scholars is that regarding the origin of John's baptism. It is alleged that John may have borrowed it from the community of the Dead Sea.[55] This thought has been intensified with the excavation of a number of large cisterns which evidently served as places of lustral washings.[56]

It is somewhat superficial to do so, but if one may assume for a moment that the baptism of John *could* be compared to that of Qumran *as a means of discerning dependence upon it*, he will be aware of some striking differences in the two. Despite Howie's statement to the contrary,[57] John's baptism was in no sense initiatory. Certainly one could not consider repentance and forgiveness of sins an

---

[50]Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 273, 4.

[54]Dupont-Sommer, *Jewish Sect*, p. 150.

[53]Allegro, *People*, pp. 48, 9.

[52]Cf. trans. in Davies' *Meaning*.

[51]Steinmann, *John the Baptist*, p. 35. Rowley, *D.S.S. & the N.T.*, p. 4.

[55]Cf. Brownlee, "John the Bap. and New Light . . . ," p. 41 where he speaks of the "important background of John's thought." Howie considers John's baptism to be directly dependent on Qumran. *Scrolls & Living Church*, p. 50. Cf. also O. Betz, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im N. T.," *Revue de Qumran* 1 (Feb. 1958), pp. 213-223. Cited in *N. T. Abstracts* III (Spring, 1959), p. 298.

[56]Brownlee, *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[57]Howie, *Scrolls & Living Church*, p. 52.

institution or organization into which one might be initiated.[58] There is no evidence that John established an *organized* following and baptized men into it.[59] Qumran baptism on the other hand is, admittedly, portrayed in its literature as an initiatory rite.[60]

One might point out further, that the Qumran group practiced repeated baptisms.[61] If the community is to be considered Essene, one might mention also the bathings in cold water before meals,[62] after excreting refuse,[63] upon contact with an alien,[64] and by a senior member upon contact with a junior member.[65] John's baptism, it must be emphasized, was not repeated from the evidence presented in the New Testament.

There can be no argument based on a difference in the baptisms due to John's requirement of repentance. Clearly the Qumran group demanded such with their baptisms.[66] But before one concludes that John could not have been influenced by the Qumran community with regard to baptism (and this influence certainly would not make him less a man of God[67]) let him consider the most important fact that one is not attempting to establish that John was an Essene in good standing *at the time* of his preaching. He is rather simply pointing out that John may at one time have been an Essene and departed from them—perhaps over this very point. Consequently it is not sufficient to point out the differences in John's baptism and that of the Dead Sea Group as establishing a case. They need not indicate more than that the two differed at that particular time.[68]

A fuller list of impressive differences could be given including the use of wine, the concepts of the priesthood, the offering of sacrifices, their views of the kingdom, Qumran's "exclusive" attitude (cf. 1QH v. 22f for example), their concepts of divine judgment, the Messiah-

---

[58]Josephus is obviously wrong in attributing "purification of the body" to John's baptism. *Ant.* 18:5:2. One would hardly consider his testimony against that of the New Test. writers.

[59]Acts 19 does not so demand. Cf. Cross, *Ancient Library*, p. 152, to the contrary. Cf. entire 1QS for organization of Qumran.

[60]Cross, *Ibid.*, p. 177. Cf. 1QS ii & iii.

[61]Cross, *Ibid.*, p. 70. He feels that 1QS ii. 25-iii. 12 suggests that the initiatory baptism was repeated each year.

[62]*War*, II viii. 5.

[63]*War*, II viii. 9.

[64]*War*, II viii. 10.

[65]*Ibid.*

[66]CDC ix. 15. Burrows, trans. in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 355. They belonged to a "covenant of repentance." Cf. CDC ii.3; ix.41 (Burrows, 357); 1QS x.20 (Burrows, 386). Qumran men are those who "turn from transgression."

[67]Note LaSor's fine discussion on the point of "influences" in *Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 217ff.

[68]Cf. K. Smyth, "Saint John the Baptist and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Month*, 20 (June, 1958), pp. 352-361. John used baptism in such a way that the rite was his own, Smyth argues. Cited in *N. T. Abstracts*, III (Spring, 1959), p. 304.

ship,[69] etc. They must all be criticized from the same standpoint, namely that one might readily agree that John taught something different from those of Qumran on all of these points and that he could still be said to have lived among the Essenes (or Qumran) or at least have been influenced by them. The differences in point of view between John and Qumran have no real bearing on the question of an *early* association.

In view of the facts now available, one may reasonably assume that John was associated with the Qumran Community in early life (perhaps as an orphan); that he learned his message from them (though in the providence of God); and then, left them to prepare publicly the Jews for Christ's ministry.

Harding College.

[69]Since the question of whether the "Messiah of Aaron and Israel" (CDC ix; Burrows, 356) has been narrowed down from the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (1QS ix, 11; Burrows 383) remains to be settled and constitutes a linguistic problem as well as an exegetical one it is not here discussed. Cf. Brownlee's conviction that such may have been the case. "John the Bap. and New Light . . . ," p. 45. Cf. also for further study, Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," Stendahl, *Scrolls and the New Test.*, pp. 54-64.

The Communist Doctrine of Morality

James D. Bales

What is the Communist's conception of morality? Does he believe in the reality of moral law? Does he accept a moral code which is similar to the one which is generally accepted in the United States? How does he view the moral values taught by Judaism and by Christianity? Does he consider himself bound by these moral values?

It is a matter of document that the Communist repudiates the moral values of Christianity and of Judaism. He repudiates the moral values of the so-called bourgeois society. Morality cannot be the expression of the will of God, for the Communist denies the existence of God. Morality to him is but a means of achieving class interests. A thing is right if it enables a class to justify, to enlarge, and to perpetuate its class interests.

It is of value to collect and document the statement of this position from published works.

This concept of morality was stated in the *Communist Manifesto.* Speaking of the proletarian, Marx wrote: "Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois projudices, behind which lurk in ambush just so many bourgeois interests."

Frederick Engels claimed that morality has always been

> a class morality; it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or, as soon as the oppressed class has become powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed.[1]

Lenin set forth more fully their view of morality on Oct. 2, 1920:

> The whole object of the training, education and tuition of the youth of today should be to imbue them with Communist ethics. But is there such a thing as Communist ethics? Is there such a thing as Communist morality? Of course there is. Often it is made to appear that we have no ethics of our own; and very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of repudiating all ethics. This is a method of shuffling concepts, of throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants.
> In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality?
> In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords and bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests. Or, instead of deducing these ethics from the commandments of morality, from the commandments of God, they deduced them from idealistic or semi-idealistic phrases, which were always very similar to God's commandments.
> We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. We say that this is deception, a fraud, which clogs

[1] *Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science* (New York: International Publishers, nd.) p. 109.

the brains of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landlords and capitalists.
We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.[2]

Other quotations from the same speech are:

It is the class struggle of the proletariat to prevent the return of the old exploiters, to unite the scattered masses of ignorant peasants into one union. The class struggle is still proceeding, and our task is to subordinate everything to the interests of this struggle. And we subordinate our Communist morality to this task. We say: Morality is that which serves to destroy the old, exploiting society and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society. Communist morality is the morality which serves this struggle.[3]

Again:

We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all the fables about morality. Morality serves the purposes of helping human society to rise to a higher level and to abolish the exploitation of labour.[4]

We must turn to the dialectic to understand fully what this means. The Communist, it must be recalled, maintains that he represents not only a different class in society, but also a class which is in *opposition* to the interests and therefore to the *values* of the "capitalist" class. Thus he does not consider himself to be bound by the same values which we acknowledge. To his way of thinking, to be bound by our moral code would be to be bound by our interests and thus to be a traitor to the interests of the proletariat. Because of this the *Communist Manifesto* says:

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, etc. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economic conditions of existence of your class.

As Howard Selsam, one of their leading philosophers in America, pointed out, the values of two classes are not only different but in opposition to one another when these classes are opposite to their interests.[5] In the dialectical view of things, be it remembered, the proletariat is the antithesis of the capitalist class. It follows, therefore, that the morality of the Communist will be in opposition to the

---

[2]The Third All-Russian Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, Oct. 2, 1920. Reprinted in House Document No. 619, *The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism*, p. 71. Also in *Lenin on Religion*. This speech to the Young Communist League is kept in print as a separate pamphlet. Over 700,000,000 copies have been published.

[3]*Ibid.*, p. 72.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 73.

[5]*Philosophy in Revolution* (New York: International Publishers, 1957), p. 136.

moraliy of the bourgeois society, and the Communist includes in this the ethical outlook and teaching of Judaism and Christianity. The needs and interests of their class, which needs and interests are determined by the Communist Party, are the foundation on which the Communist's morality rests.[6]

In fact, Communists claim that their interests and the interests of the masses throughout the world are identical:

> What is the purpose of this vicious smear? Why do anti-Communists artificially oppose the interests of the U. S. S. R. to those of the working people of other countries?
> What does this statement by Khrushchov on behalf of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. and all Soviet workers show? Primarily, it mirrors the world-historic fact that the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the interests of the C. P. S. U., are the same as those of the world proletrian movement. In framing their tasks for the immediate and the more distant future, the working people of the U. S. S. R. and their vanguard, the C. P. S. U., proceed in all their practical activities from the unity and identity of the national and international tasks confronting the working class. This was so in the past, and it is so today, when the Soviet people are building a Communist society.[7]

Thus, it follows that a thing is moral if it supports the interests of C. P. S. U.

What this means can be seen by considering three moral principles. First, "Thou shalt not steal." The Communist maintains that this is the law of a property holding class whereby they protect their property. It is thus subordinated to class interest.[8] If theft be wrong, the institution of private property must be right although it may be abused. The Communist maintains that the institution of private property is wrong, therefore the law "Thou shalt not steal" is but a means by which the property holding class maintains its hold on its ill-gotten gain. Since the Communist represents a class with interests which oppose that of the property holding class, he believes that it is right to steal if stealing will help the Party. The revolution in Russia was financed in part by bank robberies.[9] The Communist in America, whether he is from Russia or an American citizen, will steal information for Russia if so directed by the Party. During World War II, Anastas Mikoyan was the real head of the Soviet Purchasing Commission which was in the United States. He

---

[6]David Guest, *A Textbook of Dialectical Materialism* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), p. 99. See also Liu Shao-chi, *How To Be a Good Communist* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1952), pp. 55-56. M. J. Olson, *Why Communism?* (New York: Workers Library Publishers, 1935), p. 62. International Affairs (Moscow: July, 1959), pp. 8-9.

[7]*International Affairs* (Moscow: July, 1959), pp. 8-9.

[8]Frederick Engels, *Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science* (New York: International Publishers, 2nd Ed.), p. 109.

[9]Bertram D. Wolfe, *Three Who Made A Revolution* (New York: The Dial Press, 1948), pp. 389-398.

gave orders to all actual Party members of the commission to get all the information possible on industry in America, especially war industries. And thus tons and tons of blueprints, parts of special machines, photographs, etc., went to Russia by airplane and lend-lease ships.[10]

Second, there is a commandment which says: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Communism maintains that this moral law is based on the idea of private property, i.e., that a woman is the private property of a man. Therefore, to protect his private property from being used by another man he teaches that it is wrong to commit adultery. Communism, on the other hand, repudiates the morality of non-communist societies. Therefore, when it is to the interest of the Party, the Communists believe that it is right to commit adultery.[11]

Third, another commandment tells children to honor their father and mother. Communism maintains that this is based on the idea that children are the private property of parents, and that therefore they owe them obedience. Children, according to Communism, must honor the State (the Party) regardless of how they may have to dishonor their parents. The *Communist Manifesto* acknowledged that the Communist will destroy the bourgeois family, the relationship of parent and child.[12] Although Communists in Russia have had to retreat from the utter destruction of the family, they are endeavoring through their educational system, including the nurseries, to build loyalty to the Party rather than to the home. Children are taught to report to the authorities any deviationism on the part of their parents. The People's Communes in Red China sometimes segregate husband from wives and children from parents. Husbands and wives are permitted to be together for only a few minutes each week. The slaves in the Communes are taught that they are against the community if they show much desire to be with their wives and families.[13] True to the "ideals" of Communism the Chinese Communists are trying to destroy the family and to make the Party the supreme object of loyalty.

If it be difficult for some people to believe the truth about the ethical code of Communism, let them remember that a Communist is a Communist and not a Christian, Jew, or theist. Why should anyone deceive himself into thinking that in spite of their express re-

---

[10]David J. Dallin, *Soviet Espionage* (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1955). See the testimony of Victor Kravchenko, who once was a high-ranking official in the Purchasing Commission, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Also his book, *I Chose Freedom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), pp. 465-466.

[11]Elizabeth Bentley, *Out of Bondage.* Compare Victor Kravchenko, *Ibid.*, p. 461.

[12]Section two: "Proletarians and Communists."

[13]*Life* Magazine, Jan. 5, 1959, pp. 64.

pudiation of God and morality that the Communists still cling to the moral code of the civilized world? Communists are taught *to live down to their unbelief*. The dictates of the Party, and its interests, and whether these interests will be advanced by a certain course of conduct, are the only problems in ethics for the consistent Communist. Thus we should not expect him to act according to our moral code, but according to his moral code. When we understand this, we shall not carry on negotiations, nor plan our actions in other matters, as if the Communist viewed himself under moral law emanating from God.

RESTORATION QUARTERLY

BOUND VOLUMES AVAILABLE

☆ GBC Plastic Bindings

☆ Clear, Transparent Plastic Covers

Volumes I, III Available at $5.00 Each

Box 431 Villanova, Pennsylvania

The Relation of Baptism to Justification By Faith Only in Luther's Teaching

Thomas N. Schulz

Martin Luther is commonly referred to as the Father of the Doctrine of "Justification by Faith Only" and he is also commonly placed by most as being in the category of the "faith only" teachers of today. That he should be represented as teaching justification by faith only to the utter exclusion of good works is according to Philip Schaff an unjust misrepresentation.[1] Among members of the churches of Christ there are those who concur with Schaff,[2] and certainly anyone who becomes familiar with the written work of Luther is bound also to agree.

It is not the main purpose of this paper to show that Luther taught the necessity of good works, though this will be apparent in the body of the paper, but to attempt to discover the importance that baptism assumed in Luther's "faith only" teaching.

Luther and his teaching must be understood in the light of the times in which he lived. In view of his early training in Roman theology, it is remarkable that he should have discovered so much Biblical truth. "Justification by faith only" is rightly understood as the key to his thinking. Schaff says that after his discovery of this concept

> henceforth the doctrine of justification by faith alone was for him to the end of life the sum and substance of the gospel, the heart of theology, the central truth of Christianity, the article of the standing or falling church.[3]

His exaggeration of the doctrine was due to his personal experience during his convent life, when a great deal of emphasis was placed on the value of works of satisfaction. Against such works of merit Luther revolted violently, for he had learned that the only merit in salvation belongs to Christ. One must not assume that what Luther meant by his phrase is automatically understood by what the expression means in the present time. One way to ascertain the concept is to inquire of the place of baptism in Luther's scheme of things. As he saw it, could it properly be called a "work of obedience," or perhaps, "a work of faith"?

---

[1]Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. VII (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 4th Ed., 1960), p. 22f.

[2]See Robert Kerry Oglesby, *A History of the Interpretation of the Relationship of Faith and Works* (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Library Abilene Christian College, 1956), p. 72f. and J. D. Thomas, "Baptism and Faith," *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (4th Quarter, 1957), p. 169.

[3]Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

Faith and Works

Luther's early concept of faith, found in his *Lectures on Psalms* (1513-1516) was bound up in his view of God's righteousness, which he said could not rise in man until his own human righteousness had utterly perished. Man could then appropriate God's righteousness by faith, but "even faith is God's gracious gift and has no meritorious value."[4] At this point Luther was reacting against the Roman Catholic teaching of personal merit by doing works of satisfaction, and he later spoke of faith as a work from which all other works flow.[5] He objected to placing so much emphasis on works of satisfaction:

> They have grossly abused it, to the ruin of Christians in body and soul. To begin with, they taught it in such a manner that the people never learned what satisfaction really is, namely, the renewal of a man's life. Then, they so continually harp on it and emphasize its necessity, that they leave no room for faith in Christ.[6]

Luther found room for faith in Romans chapter three. Here he inserted and coupled the word "only" with "faith," and rather than apologize for so doing he later stoutly defended his action, arguing that the *sense* of the word was there; and in order to supply this sense in his German translation he could do it only by adding the word that soon caused a great furor.[7]

Reaction was inevitable. He was soon called to defend his new doctrine against his religious opponents and also from abuse by those who interpreted the doctrine to mean "Let us continue in sin that grace may abound" (Rom. 6:1).[8] His clearest statements concerning the relation of faith and works are found in *A Treatise on Christian Liberty*, written in 1520. In setting forth the relation of faith and works, he made a distinction between the inner and outer man.

> Since, therefore, this faith can rule only in the inward man, as Romans 10 says, "With the heart we believe unto righteousness"; and since faith alone justifies, it is clear that the inward man cannot be justified, made free, and be saved by any outward work or dealing whatsoever, and that works, whatever their character, have nothing to do with this inward man.[9]

Turning to the outward man, Luther dealt with the abuses of this teaching.

---

[4]James Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, Vol. I (Iondon: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925), p. 165.

[5]Martin Luther, "Treatise on Good Works," *Works of Martin Luther*, 1520, trans. W. A. Lambert, Vol. I (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1943), pp. 188-190.

[6]*Ibid.*, "*The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*," trans. A. T. W. Steinhaiuser, Vol. II, p. 253.

[7]Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., *A Compendium of Luther's Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. 100f.

[8]Schaff, *Op. Cit.*, p. 23.

[9]Martin Luther, "A Treatise on Christian Liberty," *Three Treatises* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1943).

> Here we shall answer those who, misled by the word "faith" and by all that has been said, now say: "If faith does all things and is alone sufficient unto righteousness, why then are good works commanded? We will take our ease and do no works, and be content with faith." I answer, Not so, ye wicked men, not so. That would indeed be proper, if we were wholly inward and perfectly spiritual men; but such we shall be only at the last day, the day of the resurrection of the dead. As long as we live in the flesh we only begin and make some progress in that which shall be perfected in the future life.[10]

The statement concerning the last day is a direct reflection of his teaching on baptism and is important to remember in relating baptism to faith. Luther's reasoning was that man is justified by faith alone inwardly but that he remains mortal in this life, and thus,

> Hre the works begin; here a man cannot take his ease; here he must, indeed, take care to discipline his body . . . and to make it subject to the spirit so that it will obey and conform to the inward man and to faith and not revolt against faith and hinder the inward man . . .[11]

Works, therefore, are necessary.

> In doing these works, however, we must not think that a man is justified before God by them . . . For since by faith, the soul is cleansed and made a lover of God, it desires that all things, and especially its own body, shall be as pure as itself . . . Nevertheless the works themselves do not justify him before God, but he does the works out of spontaneous love in obedience to God, and considers nothing except the approval of God, whom he would in all things most scrupulously obey.[12]

The conclusion:

> We should think of the works of a Christian man who is justified and saved by faith because of the pure and free mercy of God, just as we would think of the works which Adam and Eve did in Paradise . . . Now Adam was created by God righteous and upright and without sin, so that he had no need to be made upright through his dressing and keeping the garden, but, that he might not be idle, the Lord gave him a work to do—to cultivate and protect the garden . . . Such also are the works of a believer.[13]

We must bear in mind that Luther was here speaking of works done by Christians after they are justified. In his *Commentary on Galatians* he appears to hold fast to his early[14] convictions. He explains Christian righteousness as "mere passive righteousness"[15] for

---

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 268.
[11]*Ibid.*, p. 268.
[12]*Ibid.*, p. 269.
[13]Luther, *Three Treatises*, p. 270.
[14]According to *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, Erwin L. Lueker, Editor-in-Chief (Saint Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1954), p. 597, his commentary first appeared in 1519, was reworked in 1523, and finally a longer one appeared in 1535. It is this last work, according to introductory statements (p. vviii), that was used in preparing this paper. It is *Luther on Galatians* (Sunbury, Pa., and Blair, Nebraska: Lutherans in All Lands Co.. reprint, 1901).
[15]*Ibid.*, p. xxiv.

which the Christian does nothing to obtain.[16] In commenting on Galatians 2:16 he teaches that the law is that which is contrary to grace, whether it is judicial, ceremonial, or the ten commandments. A man is not justified by keeping such law.[17] Nor will the "works manufactured by the Schoolmen" suffice.[18] The merit of salvation is in Christ, and he must be apprehended in the heart of man by faith. "Wherefore God doth accept or account us righteous, not only for our faith in Christ."[19]

But the problem of good works is ever present.

> Now, when I have thus apprehended Christ by faith, and through him am dead to the law, justified from sin, delivered from death, the devil and hell, then I do good works, I love God, I give thanks to him, I exercise charity towards my neighbour.[20]

Here again he made it plain that good works are done by Christians after they have been justified by faith alone. He now, however, made an interesting division of faith. There is an absolute faith, and there is a compound or incarnate faith. Absolute faith is faith apart from any works whatsoever, and it is this faith which is under consideration when the scriptures speak absolutely of justification or being justified, as is to be seen in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians. But when the scripture speaks of rewards and works, there the faith referred to is compound or incarnate faith.[21] His effort here seemed to be that of keeping justification distinct from the works that follow it. This seems to be the basis for the Lutheran distinction between justification and sanctification here being, in the narrow sense of the term, spiritual growth following justification.[22]

Whatever Luther's purpose in making this division of faith might have been, he made it clear, in referring to the "working-Abraham," that faith is pre-eminent.

> Faith therefore doeth all alone in the works of the faithful. Abraham is called faithful, because faith is spread throughout the whole person of Abraham: so that, beholding him working, I see nothing of the carnal or working Abraham, but of the believing Abraham.[23]

There is no room in Luther's conception of justification for works of merit. Justification takes place at a point—when man apprehends Christ by faith. In fine distinctions, it is the inward man who is justified by faith alone, and this faith is defined in terms of absolute faith—faith apart from any works at all. Good works are

---

[16]*Ibid.*, p. xxvi.
[17]*Ibid.*, p. 129.
[18]*Ibid.* p,. 133f.
[19]*Ibid.*, p. 137.
[20]*Ibid.*, 163f.
[21]*Ibid.*, p. 25.
[22]*Lutheran Cyclopedia*, "Sanctification," p. 942.
[23]Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*," p. 261.

necessary, but they follow justification. They are the result of incarnate faith. They are designed to bring the outer man into subjection to the inner will, which process can perhaps rightly be called sanctification. But even these works of sanctification have no merit, for faith doeth all alone in the works of the faithful.

Baptism

Luther definitely viewed baptism as a sacrament, in accordance with the view of the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, as Schaff says, "He even makes more of it than the Romanists . . ."[24] He in a sense incorporated the sacrament of penance into his sacramental view of baptism and thereafter denied that such a sacrament as penance existed. A statement defining a sacrament as he viewed it is found in *A Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and Concerning the Brotherhoods* (1519):

> Like the sacrament of holy baptism, the holy sacrament of the altar, . . . has three parts which it is necessary for us to know. The first is the sacrament, or sign, the second is the significance of this sacrament, the third is the faith required by both of these; . . . The sacrament must be external and visible, and have some material form; the significance must be internal and spiritual, within the spirit of man; faith must apply and use both of these.[25]

In the sacrament God offers to all who partake of it forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.[26] It is this sacramental concept of baptism dependent on faith for its efficacy to save that caused such great difficulty when Luther was later called upon to explain and defend infant baptism.

One of his earliest and clearest works on baptism, *Treatise on Baptism,* appeared in 1519. Several things are important to keep in mind in reference to this work. In it Luther was primarily concerned with the baptism of infants, and it was written before the Anabaptist controversy and before Luther was obliged to defend his view of baptism set forth here in relation to infants.[27] The Anabaptists rejected infant baptism because it lacks the element of faith on the part of the baptized;[28] in later years Luther seemed to have difficulty attributing faith to infants at baptism.

> Baptism (German, *die Taufe*) is called in the Greek language *baptismos,* in Latin *mersio,* which means to plunge something entirely into the water, so that the water closes over it. And although in many places it is the custom no longer to thrust and plunge children into the font of baptism, but only to pour the baptismal water upon them out of the font, nevertheless, the former is what should be done; and it would be right, ac-

---

[24]Schaff, *op. cit.,* p. 218.
[25]Luther, *Works of Martin Luther,* Vol. II, p. 9.
[26]*Lutheran Cyclopedia,* "Sacraments, The," p. 936.
[27]Luther, *Works of Martin Luther,* Vol. I, p. 51.
[28]Schaff, *op. cit.,* p. 604.

cording to the meaning of the word *Taufe*, that the child, or whoever is baptised, should be sunk entirely into the water, and then drawn out again . . .[29]

We see here his view of the proper action of baptism and also that while he did consider older persons, he was primarily here concerned with the baptism of infants. He speaks of the sign of baptism as consisting of thrusting into the water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and being drawn out again.[30] The significance is a dying to sin and a resurrection in the grace of God. The old man, conceived and born in sin, is drowned, and a new man, born in grace, comes forth.[31] But baptism is not thus complete, and it is important here to get the complete picture of Luther's view of the significance of baptism:

> This significance of baptism, viz., the dying or drowning of sin, is not fulfilled completely in this life, nay, not until man passes through bodily death also . . . The sacrament, or sign, is quickly over . . . but the thing it signifies, viz., the spiritual baptism, the drowning of sin, lasts so long as we live, and is completed only in death. Then it is that man is completely sunk in baptism, and that things come to pass which baptism signifies.[32]

The death (of Romans 6:3f.) to Luther is not merely a death to sin at the point of baptism, but it contemplates also the final physical death of man. Baptism is not a single act, but a process extending throughout the entire earthly life of the one baptized. But let Luther further explain himself:

> From this it follows that when a man comes forth out of baptism, he is pure and without sin, wholly guiltless. But there are many who do not rightly understand this, and think that sin is no more present, and so they become slothful and negligent in the killing of their sinful nature . . . To correct this wickedness God has devised the plan of making it altogether new . . . This plan He begins in baptism, which signifies the death and resurrection at the Last Day . . . Therefore, so far as the sign of the sacrament and its significance are concerned, sins and the man are both already dead, and he has risen again, and so the sacrament has taken place; but the work of the sacrament has not yet fully been done, that is to say, death and the resurrection at the Last Day are yet before us. Man, therefore, is altogether pure and guiltless, but sacramentally, which means nothing else than that he has the sign of God, i.e., baptism, by which it is shown that his sins are all to be dead, and that he too, is to die in grace, and at the Last Day to rise again, pure, sinless, guiltless to everlasting life. Because of the sacrament, then, it is true that he is without sin and guilt; but because this is not yet completed, and he still lives in sinful flesh, he is not without sin, and not in all things pure, but has begun to grow into purity and innocence.[33]

Life, therefore, to Luther, is a perpetual baptism, and this growth

---

[29]Luther, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
[30]*Ibid.*, p. 56.
[31]*Ibid.*, 57.
[32]*Loc. Cit.*
[33]Luther, *Works of Martin Luther*, Vol. I, pp. 59, 60.

in purity and innocence may be explained in terms of sanctification,[34] and we may see here a connection between these works of sanctification in baptism and Luther's conception of "incarnate faith."

If it be asked how baptism can thus help in one's sanctification, Luther replied, "because in it God allies Himself with you, and becomes one with you in a gracious covenant of comfort."[35] You pledge to God a desire to die to sin, and he in turn gives you grace, "and pledges Himself not to count against you the sins which remain in your nature after baptism . . ."[36] So long as you keep your promise, God will keep his.

When a Christian falls into sin,

> . . . he should the more remember his baptism, and how God has there made a covenant with him to forgive all his sins, if only he has the will to fight against them, even until death. Upon this truth, upon this reliance with God, a man must joyfully dare to rely, and then baptism goes again into operation and effect. . .[37]

Here Luther found the place to exclude the sacrament of penance. The works of this sacrament were designed to satisfy for sins committed after baptism, but to repent, according to Luther, is simply to look again to one's baptism, and therefore the satisfaction of penance is of no value. Forgiveness is bound up in God's mercy, promised in baptism, and not in one's own works of satisfaction.[38]

For one's baptism to be effective throughout life, then, he must hold firm faith in its significance. Faith is the third part of the sacrament, and this faith Luther staunchly defended.

> The very first thing necessary, then, is faith in these words and signs; for when God speaks and gives signs man must firmly and wholeheartedly believe that what He says and signifies is true. . . This faith pleases God above all things, and does Him the highest honor, because it believes Him to be true, and a righteous God. Therefore He, in turn, counts this faith to us as righteousness good and sufficient unto salvation.[39]

Faith in the sacrament is necessary, and this faith God counts as righteousness. Faith appropriates and applies to one's self what the sacrament offers. As long as he holds fast to faith in God's mercy in its relation to baptism, his baptism will always be effectual.[40]

> So we find that through sin baptism is, indeed, hindered in its works, i.e., in the forgiveness and the slaying of sin; yet only by unbelief in its operation is baptism brought to nought. Faith, in turn, removes the hindrance to the operation of bap-

---

[34]*Ibid.*, p. 53.
[35]*Ibid.*, p. 60.
[36]*Ibid.*, p. 61.
[37]*Ibid.*, p. 65. See also Martin Luther, *Luther's Large Catechism* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1935), p. 170.
[38]Luther, *Works of Martin Luther, op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 65.
[39]*Ibid.*, "An Argument in Defense of All the Articles of Dr. Martin Luther Wrongly Condemned in the Roman Bull" (1521), trans. C. M. Jacobs, Vol. III, pp. 19, 20.
[40]*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 65.

tism. So much depends on faith.[41]

To repudiate one's baptism, then, would be fatal, and Luther found occasion to object to the Roman teaching of reliance on works of satisfaction after baptism and the Anabaptist contention that faith in infant baptism and infant baptism itself were invalid.

> Thus are they become nothing else but ministers of the law, and law-workers, calling back the people from baptism, faith, the promises of Christ, to the law and works, turning grace into law and law into grace.[42]

Baptism to Luther was a sacrament administered primarily to infants. It was of life-long efficacy as long as one continued to have faith in the sacrament through which God channeled his mercy, grace, and forgiveness. The faith God counted to the baptized as righteousness.

The Relation of Baptism to Faith

Faith alone in Luther's teaching justifies; and when one is justified, he has peace with God, enjoys Christian liberty, performs good works, and is filled with the hope of eternal life.[43] But he also says, in unmistakable language, that baptism saves and that without it no one can be saved.[44] He further appears to ascribe to baptism the same benefits that he ascribes to justification by faith alone, viz., remission of sins, righteousness, peace, consolation, joy of spirit, salvation, life, and Christ himself.[45] It would appear that baptism is almost equated with justification and that the faith involved in both is the primary factor. At the risk of being too arbitrary the following parallel is set forth:

Faith Alone	*Baptism*
1. Justifies (absolute faith).	1. Justifies (faith is the key in the sacrament).
2. Produces good works (sanctification); they are the result of incarnate faith.	2. Effective in fight against sin sanctification) as long as faith is maintained.

---

[41]*Ibid.*, p. 65.

[42]Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*, p. 147. "Calling back from baptism" must be understood in the context of Luther's conception of baptism, i.e., it is effectual from infancy to death. These people who were being called back it seems, were first baptized as infants. The Anabaptists were urging men and women baptized in infancy to repudiate that baptism, and the Romanists (both groups are attacked by Luther in the statement) were urging works of penance to satisfy for sins committed after baptism. Both groups then were construed by Luther as calling back people from baptism, a baptism that as a sacrament had been effectual since infancy and would continue to be effectual as long as it were not repudiated. In this view there was no need for rebaptism, nor for works of satisfaction; hence, Luther's remonstrance. The "calling back from faith" is also to be understood in the same connection. The baptism viewed as infant baptism could here hardly be construed to be "obedince of faith."

[43]*Lutheran Cyclopedia*, "Justification," p. 543.

[44]Luther, *Large Catechism*, p. 162,.

[45]Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*, Comment on Gal. 3:27, p. 347.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL

Though it is imposisble to make baptism parallel because of its lifelong duration, with either absolute or incarnate faith, there is nevertheless a definite relationship between baptism and justification that it seems impossible to overlook, and the key to both sides is faith.

If Luther had conceived of baptism in relation to adults instead of infants, we might be more successful in harmonizing baptism into the total picture of justification by faith alone. But the task is complicated by thinking of infants as the subject of baptism, which we must do to be true to Luther's view. That Luther was inconsistent in his view of baptism based on faith and his defense of infant baptism is apparent. Schaff says, "Luther's view of baptismal regeneration seems to be inconsistent with his chief doctrine of justification by faith alone."[46] With faith being the key to justification and the sacrament, how could Luther apply either justification or baptism to infants? His early view expressed in the *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520) brought in the vicarious faith and prayers of the parents or the church.[47] When the Anabaptist controversy intensified, he seemed constrained to attempt other explanations. He in one instance ascribed real faith to infants on the basis of Matthew 18:6;[48] and in another instance in apparent contradiction to his definition of a sacrament and the importance of faith therein he maintained that baptism is valid and effectual even in the absence of faith.[49]

However inconsistent this appears to us, the fact remains. Probably it was because of his concept of original sin and the influence of his early learning in the Roman church that he defended infant baptism all of his life as it is still defended by the Lutheran Church today.[50] However it is not our purpose in this paper to point out the errors of Luther's doctrine, but simply to represent his views of the relationship of faith and baptism.

The point on which we would like to have more information—how Luther tied baptism together with faith in the justification of an adult believer—is uncertain. He did make provision for the baptism of people not baptized as infants.[51] But he seems never to have expressed the relation of faith and baptism in terms of the "obedi-

---

[46]Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 219; see also Edgar M. Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948), p. 136.

[47]*Works of Martin Luther*, Vol. II, p. 253.

[48]*Luther's Small Catechism* (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1943), p. 174.

[49]*Luther's Large Catechism*, p. 165ff.

[50]*Lutheran Cyclopedia*, "Grace, Means of," p. 427.

[51]In the *Small Catechism* he says, "Who is to be baptized?" A. "All nations, that is, all human beings, young and old, are to be baptized." "What distinction is to be made in baptizing?" "A. Those who can receive instruction are to be baptized after they have been instructed in the principal doctrinets of the Christian religion."

ence of faith." Baptism is to be thought of more as a work of God than a work of man, even taking man's faith into account.

> Whosoever then do believe in Christ, whether they be men or women, bond or free, are all saints; not by their own works, but by the *works of God*, which they receive by faith; as his word, *his sacraments*, the passion of Christ . . . (Emphasis mine, TS).[52]

In his *Large Catechism* he makes the reference specific:

> But if they say, as they are wont to do: Baptism itself is a work, and you say your works avail nothing for salvation; where then is faith? You must answer: Yes, our works truly avail nothing for salvation, but baptism is not our work, it is the work of God . . . Thus you clearly see baptism is no work which we do, but a treasure which God gives us and of which faith lays hold . . .[53]

Perhaps the correct idea is that man, whether adult or infant, is passive in baptism and receive the benefit which God works in the act of baptism. Though it is not clear that this is how Luther viewed adult action here, it seems to fit the frame of reference. Christian righteousness is to him a "mere passive righteousness."

Conclusion

That Luther viewed baptism in terms of "a work of obedience" or an "obedience of faith" seems to us to be uncertain. It is certain that faith is paramount in both justification and baptism. As faith is the essential part of the "sacrament" of baptism, so perhaps only the faith in baptism is to be associated with justification, in which case all of salvation is still dependent on faith alone.

We venture to say, however, that had he been able to admit of adult baptism apart from a sacramental connotation, he would have construed it as a work of faith on the part of the believer to which no personal merit is to be attached. Luther's reaction was against works of merit, and while he was careful never to allow the thought that there was any personal merit attached to the performance of good works, nevertheless he taught that they were essential and urged them upon his followers. In respect to the necessity of baptism for salvation and good works for sanctification, he has little in common with some of the contemporary "faith only" teachers who relate the teaching to the idea of "trusting Jesus as one's personal savior" and ignoring the ordinances of the Gospel through which God's Word promises the remission of sins. It would be interesting to trace the means by which Luther's concept of "faith only" emerges in present day thinking with its exclusion of baptism, but that is a study beyond the scope of this paper.

---

[52] *Ibid.*
[53] *Ibid.*

Equality in Giving (2 Cor. 8:13)

David Lipscomb

The *Guide* gives us an excellent article on giving, but quotes 2 Cor. 8:13 to prove that there should be an equality in the members of a church in giving. And it insists that to establish that equality it is necessary that the deacons shall make themselves fully acquainted with the income, expenses and liabilities of every member, and as a board of equalization to assess each individual's rate. Is this the equality taught in this passage? Does the Bible authorize this kind of procedure? Does it approve means given under this kind of stress? The passage has special reference to the raising of means to assist the poor disciples in Judea. Paul the year before had started the Corinthian brethren in the work of raising the fund by the weekly contribution as each was prospered. The whole year was consumed in this work. Paul and his fellow messengers will soon be at Corinth to receive this contribution, and he writes a letter beforehand to admonish them to be faithful and diligent in completing the begun work by the time they reached there. He urged a variety of considerations why they should do this, then met the objection that in thus helping these needy Jews, they were being eased and we burdened. He said, "This is not that others (the poor Jews) may be eased and ye burdened, but by an equality, that now your abundance (the abundance of the Corinthians) may supply their (the poor Jews) want, that their (the Jews) abundance may be a supply for your (Corinthians) want, that there may be equality."

This equality was to be between the Jews and Corinthians, had not a remote reference to maintaining equality in the gifts of the members of the Corinthian church. It possibly meant that sometime you Corinthians may be poor and needy and the Jews in possession of abundance. Then it will be their duty to help you. So equalization will be brought about. But I believe it means, For if you Gentiles have been made partakers of their (the Jews) spiritual things, their (the Gentiles) duty is to minister unto them in carnal things (Rom. 15:27). Since the Jews brought the gospel to you in your darkness, it is reasonable you should help them in their need of carnal things. It certainly has no reference to equality among the members of a congregation in giving.

Every Christian is placed on honor by God, and only free-will offerings purposed in the heart are acceptable to the Master.

It may be asked how then can church demands be met, so as to work smoothly and successfully, when such a large proportion of the members lack a proper sense of honor toward God in this matter and fail to cheerfully sacrifice to the Lord as they are prospered? Our answer is the church ought not to work smoothly and success-

fully with many of this class of members in it. God intends his church to prosper only as it is pure, and all efforts to force a prosperity without corresponding consecration of hearts, lives and means to the service of God, is contrary to the will and provisions of God. Hence the effort to raise means and force a prosperity and increase, that does not grow out of an earnest, self-sacrificing devotion on the part of its members, corrupts the church yet more and more and is a curse and not a blessing to the world. To spread a lukewarm, selfish, unconsecrated church is a curse rather than a blessing to the world, and is a dishonor and not an honor to God.

A pure consecrated church will spread by the force of the zeal and devotion of its own members. Only a cold, lukewarm, selfish, unconsecrated church needs other devices to spread it. It is not God's wish that such churches should spread. So it is not God's wish that any human devices should be brought in to aid the spread of his gospel. When the church has not zeal, devotion, self-consecration to cheerfully and gladly do the will of God, it should be taught its duty. If it refuses to do it, it would be a blessing to the world and an honor to God for it to die.

(Reprint from *The Gospel Advocate,* p. 822, December 29, 1886)

Book Reviews

Editor, Pat Harrell

Theology

The Case for Theology in Liberal Perspective, by L. HAROLD DEWOLF. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 206 pp. $3.50.

The Case for a New Reformation Theology, by WILLIAM HORDERN. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 176 pp. $3.50.

The Case for Orthodox Theology, by EDWARD JOHN CARNELL. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 162 pp. $3.50.

The appearance of this trilogy is indicative of the growing trend among prominent groups of contemporary Christendom to become theologically intelligible to the layman. It is also indicative of the feeling of ecumenicity among groups of Protestantism, who are not dogmatically asserting the unimpeachableness of their position, but are rather attempting to communicate with one another in order to resolve their differences—a commendable attitude wherever it is found.

As would be expected the authors deal with the various problems that ever and again turn up in theological discussion. In this review the books will be discussed together under four of these problems which to the reviewer seem normative. By such a procedure the readers of this periodical should be able to get a clear-cut view of the distinguishing theological views of the three authors.

1) The Incarnation:

Although DeWolf uses Biblical terminology, it does not hold the same content that the Biblical writers intended. DeWolf still would distinguish, in a thoroughgoing Liberal sense, between "the Jesus of history, and the Christ of faith." For DeWolf any deity of Jesus is clearly the result of apotheosis (p. 70f). "Literally to worship the man Jesus of Nazareth would be idolatry" (p. 72). ". . . Christ as God is not to be confused with Jesus the man of Nazareth" (p. 72). Hordern admits that "Christianity is based on the claim that the Lord God, the Creator of all, became incarnate in Christ" (p. 83). But he does not believe that such an assertion can be "proved." The claim of incarnation places a demand upon us for decision. It becomes a challenge to the faith presupposition by which we live. ". . . when the Christian confesses faith that Christ is God incarnate, he can only answer 'why?' " by saying, "Because Jesus is Jesus." The total impact that he makes upon us is such that we can only respond to him in faith (p. 85). Carnell, true to his position of a theology based "squarely on the authority of the Bible" accepts without question

the fact of the Incarnation (p. 39).

2) The Atonement

DeWolf tries hard to avoid the appearance of being classified as a proponent of the "moral influence" theory of atonement. But to the reviewer he fails. "Moral influence" *is* the crux of DeWolf's theory of atonement (as it is for most Liberal theologians). Of course a moral influence does result from the death of Jesus. But if this is all, then the inevitable question—why Jesus? Why not any man's death? The usual Liberal quip, "but all men are not Jesus," is not a sufficient answer to the question. Hordern examines the three traditional theories of atonement: 1) The "ransom theory," or as Aulén calls it, "the classical" theory; 2) The "satisfaction" or Anselmian theory; 3) The "moral influence" or Abelardian theory. He finds values and faults with each theory. Hordern is to be commended for affirming that, "The Christian doctrine of salvation is the doctrine of God's atoning work. Christianity is built on the fact of atonement. Through the life, death, and resurrection of Christ man finds that he has been at one with God, that he is restored to the relationship with God for which he was intended. Apart from this fact there is no gospel" (p. 142).

Carnell clearly accepts the "satisfaction" theory of atonement. If Christ had merely died a corporeal death, no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite, also, that he should feel the severity of the divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God, and satisfy his justice" (p. 69). One is not surprised then to find Carnell saying: "Unless we perceive that Christ satisfied divine justice, we miss the very essence of the gospel" (p. 68). The reviewer feels that Carnell is wrong here. The Bible expresses the truth of the atonement through various pictures. It is an error to accept one as orthodox to the exclusion of the others.

3) The Resurrection:

DeWolf has little to say about the resurrection—in fact hardly one page. He speaks of it reverently and refers to it as a "mystery" (p. 81). But this is misleading (we do not mean that DeWolf is purposely misleading) for DeWolf does not believe in the literal resurrection of Jesus. His words "living presence" and "experience" are stock words in Liberal terminology. He feels that the records are contradictory and that we are unable to construct "precisely what happened on Easter morning" (p. 81). But DeWolf seems to overlook that the records do agree precisely in the main point under question—the fact of the resurrection. Hordern does not deal with the resurrection *per se.* (Such an omission seems inexcusable.) But in all fairness it should be pointed out that in two statements (p. 143 and p. 145) Hordern does indicate an acceptance of a literal resurrection. But these statements are not explicit. Nor does Carnell treat

the resurrection as a separate subject. But in several places he indicates a clear-cut acceptance of it. Furthermore he maintains that the theology of Galatians and Romans is normative, and certainly the literal resurrection of Jesus is central to both of these books. Still, it would have been "nice" for one book of the trilogy to have dealt with the problem seriously.

4) Revelation:

Concerning this vital subject DeWolf says, "We know nothing about God that he has not chosen to communicate to us" (p. 17). This communication of God to man, DeWolf calls (in its broadest sense) "the word of God." This he defines further as "any act of God by which communication occurs between God and man." The Bible may be spoken of as "Word of God" (with a capital W) in that it is a great witness to a "cumulative series of divine acts." But for DeWolf this "witness" is certainly not an infallible witness, because in it "are to be found the erring words of men as well as the authoritative word of God" (p. 47). It becomes the task of the readers to discriminate between the two. Apparently the "touchstone" by which this discrimination is made is "the spirit of Christ," and the "scientific knowledge of our times." As to the authority of the Bible, this is found when through it God speaks to the living faith of the reader. There is no unique authority here, for God also "has spoken through general revelation or the word that he now speaks in faithful hearts open to his presence" (p. 56f). To the reviewer this concept of revelation and authority seems somewhat nebulous, and one is left with a feeling of "what does he really mean?" DeWolf seems suspiciously close to Friedrich Schleiermacher's "feeling of absolute dependence."

It is with the problem of revelation that Hordern is most concerned. This is the heart of his book. Chapters 2, 3, 4 (over half of the book) deal with this problem. Hordern titles these chapters, "Faith and Reason," "The Nature of Revelation," and "How Can We Know That Revelation Is Revelation." In the chapter on "Faith and Reason" an impressive argument against the possibility of Natural Theology is developed. Hordern appears to be influenced by certain philosophical arguments of the logical positivists. In argumentation Hordern "outdoes" both DeWolf and Carnell on the question of Natural Theology. To the reviewer, such is unfortunate, for it seems that there is real validity in the position of DeWolf and Carnell favoring Natural Revelation. Hordern's understanding of the Bible is not an infallible objective revelation from God. He seems to ask, What good is an infallible revelation without an infallible hearer—"An objective revelation is not inerrant until it is inerrantly received" (p. 59).

But Hordern fails to see that he is here assuming the very thing he is trying to prove. He is arguing from his definition of

revelation as "encounter." But it is precisely this that the Fundamentalist denies. That the Bible *is* objective inerrant revelation whether or not it is received is the Fundamentalist's fortress. In fact according to Hordern's definition of revelation the Bible cannot really be called revelation—it only "points to revelation." Revelation is not "items of information in the form of propositions" (p. 56). What God reveals in revelation "is God . . . It is not the revelation of an object to a subject, but . . . subject to subject, a revelation of mind to mind" (p. 55, Hordern is here quoting the words of John Baillie). It is only when the Holy Spirit testifies through the words of the Bible and the "I-Thou" encounter is experienced that revelation takes place. To the question, "How do we know that revelation is revelation," Hordern replies, revelation is "self authenticating." There is no external criteria by which we can judge the genuineness of revelation. God is unique and his revealing of himself is in a category by itself. Therefore we can not *a priori* set up a standard to judge his revelation. Those who do, make their standard, instead of the revelation, the authority. How do we know revelation is revelation? Hordern's answer is, "we just know it." There may be "food for thought" in what Hordern has to say—but in the final analysis, having criticized both Liberals and Conservatives for subjectivity in their theories of revelation, it would seem that Hordern has failed to develop a theory free of this fault.

As one would expect, Carnell readily admits both "general" and "special" revelation. "Special revelation" is the Bible. "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the word of God written" (p. 33). Furthermore the Bible is plenarily inspired. The Old Testament is accepted on the authority of Jesus (who is represented in the Gospels as accepting the Old Testament as the word of God (p. 40). The validity of the New Testament is accepted on the evidence of the trustworthiness of the authors (p. 42). The Apostles were commissioned to define Christian doctrine. The question therefore is whether or not the Apostles teach any given doctrine (p. 42). From this the doctrine of plenary inspiration logically follows. The problem of canonicity is simply a problem of authenticity—"Whether or not these books were really written by the men whose names they bore and to whom they were generally ascribed" (p. 46). Carnell submits to the judgment of the early church because he has "no reason to question the ground on which the sufficiency of evidences was established. If God ordained the church to hear the word of the Son, the means to this end were also ordained" (p. 47). Unfortunately, to the reviewer, Carnell's arguments on this matter seem rather dated. He does not deal with the problems that have been raised by modern Biblical critical studies. This is not to imply that these problems cannot be solved. It simply means that Carnell could have rendered a greater service if he had faced them.

Furthermore, one wonders just how orthodox Carnell really is. Is his tirade against Fundamentalism necessary in this type of book? Just exactly what does he mean by "plenary"?—a question that must be raised in view of his admissions in the chapter entitled "Difficulties." On what basis does he assert that the theology of Romans and Galatians is the norm by which everything else in Scripture is undersood? (p. 99). What does he mean when he refers to Orthodoxy as a "worthy Christian option"? Are we to understand that Neo-orthodoxy and Liberalism are also "worthy Christian options"?

The reviewer feels that Hondern "comes out the best" in this three way discussion—not because he is nearer the truth, but rather because his ability to state his case seems to surpass the others.

It is interesting that DeWolf is not concerned to be a "good Liberal," or to "defend Liberalism," he is only interested to write "in Liberal perspective." This it seems is indicative of the times. And it would appear that the charge so often heard today is true—Liberalism as a Christian theological system is dead—and rightly so, for how can a system that does not accept the Incarnation, the necessity of Jesus' death for man's sins, and the literal resurrection, legitimately be called Christian?

In spite of the above criticisms, all three of the authors are competent in their field, and the trilogy thus serves as an excellent introduction to contemporary theological problems. In this area it should render a genuine service.

Don H. McGaughey
Brookline, Massachusetts

Bible Geography

Atlas of the Early Christian World. F. VAN DER MEER and CHRISTINE MOHRMAN. Translated and edited by Mary F. Hedland and H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson and sons, 1958. 216 pp. $15.00.

A companion work to Nelson's *Atlas of the Bible* by Grollenberg, the *Atlas of the Early Christian World* represents the new genre of atlases which, in addition to maps, contain copious illustrations and full text discussions. Originally published as *Atlas van de oudchristelijke Wereld,* this work fills a void in reference materials for the study of early church history.

As a "cultural and historical document," the Atlas provides a survey of Christianity during its first six centuries. The 42 six-color maps, compiled by Professor van der Meer, assemble clear and precise information on a wealth of subjects: location of church buildings and bishoprics, sites of inscriptions and monuments, the milieux of the principal authors, the spread of the church at various periods, paths of the pilgrims, and early monastic settlements. The 620 gravure plates are an unrivaled collection of pictures of early Christian art and architecture, illustrating all facets of church life. The commentary is woven of three strands. First, there are

the captions to the illustrations, providing information about the date, origin, provenance, and content of the object pictured. (Unfortunately the original source and date of inscriptions and sculptures are not always indicated.) Second, comes the authors' commentary on the topics around which the text is arranged, providing the background to the themes which the photograph illustrate. The third element consists of a selection of quotations from writings of the first six centuries—both pagan and Christian—which reveal the attitudes, beliefs, and motives behind the works illustrated.

The cross references in the text to the maps and plates, combined with the full indexes, unify the material and make it readily available for reference purposes. The combination of text and pictures makes vivid the prevailing motifs of each age.

The most distinctive feature of the atlas is the illumination of the cultural life, a feature absent from ordinary church histories. The value of Christian art for the study of church history is not generally recognized. Hence, much in the atlas requires an advanced knowledge for its full significance. Nevertheless, the work is valuable even for an introductory course in that it supplements the literary evidence from which most church histories are almost exclusively constructed. Much archæological material previously known only to the specialist is now made available.

A number of interesting items of information emerge from a study of the atlas. On page 62 the custom of signing oneself with holy water from a small font is traced to the practice of cleansing the mouth and hands with water from a fountain at the entrance to the Constantinian basilica of Peter on the Vatican.

The evidence of iconography (p. 74) shows that the halo was first used to encircle the head of the emperor before being transferred to Christ.

The architectural form of early church buildings was determined by the five basic requirements of Christian worship: a large assembly room designed to hold the whole community; the *cathedra* of the presiding bishop, placed upon a podium; the pulpit for the reading of the Scriptures and the direction of the singing of the psalms; the baptistery, which was outside the assembly place, as a symbol that baptism was not "in the church" but the means of getting in; and the table for the Lord's Supper, which was always and everywhere in the form of a table in deliberate contrast to the form of pagan altars.

Those receiving baptism were often depicted as children (small adults) because those born anew to the life of the Spirit were considered newly born children. One recognizing the motifs in early Christian baptism is not deceived into regarding these pictures as evidence of infant baptism (even Christ at his baptism is portrayed one-half size).

The authors of the atlas maintain that sacred images were not

venerated until the end of the sixth centry (pp. 155, 156). Interesting information on the development of Christ's facial type is also included (p. 160).

The technical excellence of this prodigious publishing achievement is marred by a number of typographical errors. The following corrections should be made: p. 33, "on" for "an"; p. 36, "A.D. 141" for "41"; p. 40, "from" for "fron"; p. 57, the date "305" for "205"; p. 124, no. "398" for "389; p. 127, "baptism and penance" for "as"; p. 141, a comma should follow nos. 463-465; p. 180, close the parenthesis in the second line about Jerusalem. The typesetter has failed to separate words properly on pp. 63 and 215. On page 178 at line 11, there must be a line of type omitted.

Pictures no. 436 and 599 are duplicates, and it would seem that the space could have been better used with a different illustration.

A paragraph from the worthwhile Epilogue may be quoted as expressing the spirit of the book and at the same time the importance of the subject with which it deals for our fragmented times. "What strikes us most here is the perfect harmony of word and image. Both arise from a trait peculiar to the Christians, that of viewing all reality in the light of the deep, profoundly Biblical sense of the figurative interrelation of all things: of Old and New Testament, of nature and divine intervention, of internal and external, of rite and reality. Hence, it follows that even the simplest texts are profound, the images full of significance, the features of the portraits intense, their gaze meaningful. These people have a message to convey." The last sentence applies also to the editors of the atlas.

Everett Fergsuon

Evolution

Evolution and Christian Thought Today. Edited by RUSSELL L. MIXTER. Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 1959. 224 pages, plus 22 plates. $4.50.

This symposium in its planning was entitled *One Hundred Years After Darwin* and was purposed to express an Evangelical voice during the time of the Darwin Centennial celebration in 1959. Apparently the book was delayed and since it came out at the end of the year, the title was changed to *Evolution and Christian Thought Today.*

It is the production of thirteen members of the American Scientific Affiliation, which is understood to consist of about 800 people in science who subscribe to an Evangelical creed. The The topics discussed are:

"The Influence of Darwin on Biology"
"The Origin of the Universe"
"The Origin of Life"
"Genetics"
"The Role of Hybridization in Evolution"
"Systematics and Speciation"
"The Distribution of Animals"
"Fossils and their Occurrence"
"Similarities—The Importance of the Obvious"
"A Creationist's Interpretation

of Prehistoric Man"
"Theology and Evolution"

Our observations in general are that it is the best single conservative book on the subject of Evolution that has appeared to date. It came out too late to be read before preparation of a speech that was given by the reviewer on this subject during the 1960 Abilene Christian College Lectureship, but its conclusions are basically the same.

Several of the authors, being men of science more than men of theology, seem to make some undue concessions to the evolutionist-view at different points in their presentation, although no one of them is really an evolutionist, and their purpose in writing seems to be a refutation of the evolutionary view, yet with scholarly objectivity. They do fully acknowledge the true facts that science has found that are claimed as supporting the evolution thesis, yet in general they show that such a conclusion is ultimately a philosophical choice rather than a scientific demonstration.

The best single chapter is that written by Carl H. Henry on the subject, "Theology and Evolution." He planned this as the beginning chapter in the book, but the editor decided to use it as the closing chapter, and this explains why he did not drive some of his points harder. The article does show a greater awareness of the theological implications of the matters discussed than do the others, but at the same time Henry demonstrates that he is also fully aware of the scientific information that has been determined at each point. Further, he is very conscious of the philosophical implications of each part of the problem and has done the best single synthesis that the reviewer knows of for a discerning audience.

Questions that the book leaves unanswered which readers of *The Quarterly* would be interested in concern the Antiquity of Man, and Biblical data on this point. Consult the reviewer's paper in the 1960 ACC lecture.

Because of the denominational viewpoint of these authors and because of their theological naiveté in different places, the reader of the book should be very careful about placing too much pressure on single statements unless he knows how it was intended by the author to be applied in given contextual situations.

Some interesting short quotations are:

"We continually overrate the perfection of the geological record."

"Since the fossil record opens with the majority of phyla already in existence, it is at least permissible to question the assumption that in earlier ages these phyla converged backward toward one primeval ancestor."

"Simpson concluded, 'This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists'."

"The absence of transitional

forms between orders, classes, and phyla is conceded equally among vertebrates, invertebrates and plants."

"We can indeed speak of a descent within the types, but not about a descent of the types."

"The theory, however, that dramatic new forms arise by chance is more incredible, and leaves the future distressingly more unpredictable, than explanation through the act of a superior intelligence."

"Supposition of abrupt emergence falls outside the field of scientific analysis just as fully as the appeal to supernatural creative forces."

". . . The whole battleground of evolution will have to be fought over again; this time not so much between scientists and theologians, as among scientists themselves."

The book lacks a thorough discussion of geology as well as some other weaknesses besides those mentioned above, but even so it is still probably the most scholarly conservative book on the subject.

J. D. Thomas

Abilene Christian College

Devotional

On Call, by Lois Rowe. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1958. 366 pp. $3.50.

On Call is a book of daily devotions for nurses written by a nurse. With each day's inspirational thought is suggested an appropriate Scripture reading and space is provided for the reader to write the object of her prayer. Miss Rowe has prescribed a convenient method for busy nurses to strengthen their spiritual life.

In Green Pastures, by Jane Merchant. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 110. $1.50.

Another volume of devotions by Miss Merchant is indeed welcome. This present work contains eighty-six selections of poetry and prayer, using the outline of the 23rd Psalm as the main headings. Her insights and inward resources fill one's spiritual cup to overflowing.

Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, by Clara E. Murray. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. 119 pp. $1.50.

A simplified and abridged *Pilgrim's Progress* is the latest addition to Baker's Devotional Reading Series. These selections, presented in pocketbook form, prove to be a helpful introduction to what is perhaps the best known inspirational book in our language.

With Christ in the Garden, by Lynn J. Radcliffe. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 80. $1.50.

Having visited the Garden of Gethsemane, the author seeks to make it real in the experiences of others through five short chapters dealing with the last hours of Jesus' life. The unusual ability of Mr. Radcliffe to make a scene come to life, coupled with a penetrating spiritual insight, creates the sensation for the reader of "coming to the garden alone."

Daily Meditations on the Seven

Last Words, by G. Ernest Thomas. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 143. $2.00.

Dr. Thomas, director of spiritual life, General Board of Evangelism of the Methodist Church, presents seven weeks of daily meditations on the last words of Jesus. Each day's devotion has an appropriate Scripture reading and prayer. Even though he is writing on a subject which has never wanted for attention, the author manages to do so with freshness.

God in My Life, by Lloyd C. Wicke. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 128. $1.00.

The bishop of the Pittsburgh Area of the Methodist Church discusses in a simple and unembellished style the relationship between one's faith and daily life. Especially provocative are the chapters dealing with "The Church in Your Home" and "God and the Day's Work." The volume has an index which will enable you to find at a later day what otherwise might be an elusive illustration.

Youth Programs on Nature Themes, by Ruth Schroeder. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 192. $2.75.

For those who work with young people, this will be a very welcome book. From a rich background Mrs. Schroeder presents twenty-three complete worship services employing themes from nature. Five of the programs are designed for campfire or candlelight services. Those who are familiar with the authoress' two other books of youth programs, will need no encouragement to secure this new volume. This obviously is a must for all those associated with youth camps.

New Testament

The Apocalypse Today, by Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 155 pp. $3.00.

T. F. Torrance, Professor of Christian Dogmatics at the University of Edinburgh, has provided a very welcome and readable exposition of the Book of Revelation. To those who are discouraged from studying the last book of the canon by the frequent bizarre interpretation of those who act as if it were the only book in the canon, this will be a sane and extremely practical book. His view of Rev. 20: 5 is that the 1,000 years is an "apocalyptic symbol of the fulness of time that has broken into the world in Jesus Christ." It is non-technical in approach.

The Gospel According to St. John, Tyndale Bible Commentaries, by R. V. G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 237 pp. $3.00.

This commentary is representative of the scholarly and conservative approach of the Tyndale Series. There is an adequate introduction to the gospel, which discusses authorship, date, and purpose. Significant ideas in paragraphs are discussed and are followed by a section of "Additional Notes" in which crucial words of the test are considered. "Water and Spirit" of John 3:5 are taken as a reference to

Christian baptism. A frank discussion of the textual problem involved in the case of the woman taken in adultery is presented. This is perhaps the best popular commentary series now available.

Practical

What Shall We Say About Alcohol? by CARADINE HOOTON. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 127 pp. $2.00.

As Secretary of the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church, the author writes from a rich background. Frequently the problem is approached with neithem empathy nor insight. This book provides a positive approach which is religious and practical. He makes his case for abstinence not by an appeal to single "proof texts" (the Bible says more about drunkenness than drinking), but by an appeal to the Christian concept of personality. While a wealth of facts are presented, the author is also concerned with what one person can do to help solve the problem. Recommended for all who are concerned with one of society's greatest problems.

Old Testament

The Minor Prophets, The Men and Their Messages, by G. CAMPBELL MORGAN. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1960. 157 pp. $2.75.

The church has taken the designation "Minor Prophets" literally and is the poorer for it. "Minor" refers only to the brevity and not to the message. For each of the twelve books Morgan provides a translation of the text, a brief introductory survey, an analysis in outline form, and a summary of the message with an application for modern times. Morgan was foremost a preacher, and this book bares a preacher's imprint. Ministers who wish to prepare a series of sermons on the prophets will find it provocative enough to stir the imagination and brief enough to stimulate creativity. Because of its popular approach and arrangement it lends itself easily to study classes.

Devotional Introduction to Job, by ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD, JR. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. 166 pp. $2.95.

In a society where Archibald MacLeish's play "J.B." can be a success, it seems strange that the book of Job remains unknown Biblical territory to most. Unfortunately, such is the case even with Christians. This work was written, as the title indicates, as a devotional commentary, although the author is aware of the scholarly works on the subject. His purpose is not to confute, but to confront the reader with the majesty and awe of Job. Although there are difficult areas which Mr. Blackwood slights, the problem of translation in 19:26 for example, this is an ideal book with which to make the acquaintance of Job.

Ordination in the Ancient Church (I)*

Everett Ferguson

In this study attention will be given to the modes of selection and installation to office among the Romans, Greeks, and Jews. Later a detailed examination of the action and significance of ordination in the fourth century will be presented. Information concerning ordination will then be traced backwards so that the lines of evidence from the background and the foreground will be made to converge upon the New Testament. After an elucidation of the New Testament materials bearing on the subject the main themes of the study will be summarized and their relevance for today noted.

The Greco-Roman Background

Roman Magistrates

The features of selection and installation of important magistrates at Rome in the last century of the Republic were determinative for the provincial towns established by Rome.[1]

The chief magistrates were elected by the citizens; the voting was by the divisions of the citizenry known as centuries, with a majority in a century determining the vote of that century and a majority of the centuries determining the will of the assembly.[2] Entrance into office was conditioned on the *designatio*, an appointment to the office made by the presiding consul in the form of a *renuntiatio*, a proclamation of the outcome of the Election. Although bound by the outcome of the Election, he had great powers in accepting or rejecting candidates according to their qualifications. Extraordinary officers and lesser magistrates were appointed by a simple Naming to the function by the magistrate entitled to do so.

The entrance day of the magistrate was January 1, and the office was passed to the person on the stated day. Although he was a private person up to the entrance day, the *designatus* was treated already as an officer, for declining the office had the same legal status as abdication.[3] The selection was the decisive thing.

---

*This article is the first of a series based on the author's Ph.D. thesis at Harvard University. The thesis itself, which contains the original texts, additional documentation, and discussion of fine points, is available at Harvard's Widener Library and on microfilm. A special feature of the study is the adoption of a technical vocabulary, signified by the use of capitalization; hence the reader should consult the glossary at the end of this article in connection with the series.

[1]We follow the definitive study of Theodor Mommsen, *Roemisches Staatsrecht* (Dritte Auflage; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1887), Vol. I, pp. 578ff. The practices at Rome must be reconstructed from scattered literary references. The situation in the provinces, both confirming and clarifying procedures at Rome, is exemplified by the civil laws of Malaca in Spain at the end of the first century—*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Vol. II (Berolini: G. Reimarum, 1869), Nos. 1963, 1964.

[2]See the article on "Voting," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 954.

[3]Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 590f.

There followed on the gaining of the office a two-fold confirmatory act. A magistrate could legally take office only if the gods were consulted. Hence, the new consul, for example, took the *auspices* on the morning of his first day in office. The purpose was to receive a favorable sign for the assumption of the office, but the very performance of the Auspication was an indication that the person had assumed office. Secondly, the assembly passed the *lex curiata de imperio* by which the community bound itself to obey the authority of the new officer within his competence. The *lex curiata* did not bestow the authority but rather set forth the same.[4]

A great amount of ceremony and formality marked the entrance (*inire*) into office. The office was not by them obtained, but rather was by them for the first time exercised, Usurpation (*usurpatio*) in the legal sense. After the first Auspication of the new consul, he put on the official dress and accompanied by lictors and friends went in solemn procession to the Capitol where he was seated in the curial chair (Solemn Seating). There he vowed to Jupiter that he had defended the state and offered sacrifice (Divine Invocation). The new consul then held a session of the Senate. Praetors, aediles, and quaestors similarly showed their entrance into office when they took their seat and first performed the function of office.[5] Within five days after assuming office the new magistrate had to present an Oath that he would observe the laws. The prevalence of the oath is seen in the fact that one was taken by the candidate when he announced his candidacy, when the proclamation of his election was made, and when he surrendered the office.[6]

Under the principate the power of the Emperor essentially limited the election-right even where the forms of Election were maintained. By the third century the manner in which emperors were in fact made became virtually a constitutional process. Following an Acclamation by the troops there was a proclamation and an Enthronement.[7]

In imperial times Porrection was known in appointment to office. A sword was given to the prefect to indicate his appointment.[8]

The following features are prominent in the appointment of the important civil officials in the Roman world: Election by the qualified voters with the important role played by the official presiding; the Invocation of the gods on the day of assuming office; the installation by Usurpation; the prevalence of Oath-taking; and the steady movement toward autocracy.

---

[4]*Ibid.*, pp. 590, 609. Here as elsewhere references to the original sources together with a translation of some of the more important may be found in the thesis.

[5]*Ibid.*, pp. 615ff.

[6]*Ibid.*,p p. 619-22. Steinwenter, "Ius iurandum," in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopaedie*, X (Stuttgart, 1919), 1256-57.

[7]H. U. Instinsky, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Muenchen: Koesel, 1955), pp. 32ff.

[8]Dio Cassius lxviii.16.

Roman Priesthoods

In the early Republican period the filling of all priestly colleges and sodalities was by Co-option.[9] However, certain lesser priests and religious functionaries were designated by the *Pontifex Maximus*. The latter was an elected official, chosen by a special assembly of seventeen of the tribes after a Nomination from their own number by the principal priests (*pontifices*). Later the same elective act by part of the tribes was inserted between Nomination and Co-option of the members of the four great priestly colleges. Nominations to the assembly convened for sacerdotal business were made by the respective colleges, which after the Election went through the form of Co-option. The Emperor's powers finally ended the independence of the priestly colleges although the old forms of Co-option remained.

Whether chosen by the members of a college, elected first by an assembly of the people, or designated by the *pontifex maximus*, the new priest had to be installed in his sacred function. The formal completion of Co-option came when the president of the college or sodality "called to sacred things" (*ad sacra vocabat*) the newly designated member, a constitutive Naming.[10]

Certain religious functionaries underwent an *inauguratio* (an Inauguration in the limited sense). The ceremony of Inauguration meant the declaration of the assent of the deity to the accomplished Election or Designation. In significance the *inauguratio* was the same as a magistrate's first taking of the auspices, the only difference being that in the latter case the official performed the function himself and in the former it was done for him by an augur. There is no evidence that *inauguratio*, or any other rite performed on the new priest, involved a change of state.[11]

The distinctive feature provided by the Roman priesthoods was their practice of Co-option.

Roman Associations

The officers of the Roman clubs were elected in an ordinary meeting by the vote of the members. The terms of office, as for civil officials, was customarily for one year, and re-election was permitted. The only ceremony attested for the induction into office is Oath-taking.[12]

---

[9]For the Roman priesthoods see Gordon J. Laing, "Priest, Priesthood (Roman)," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, X (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), pp. 325-335. Cited *ERE*. The references on each class of the priestly personnel may be found in Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Roemer* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Zweite Auflage; Muenchen: Ch. H. Beck, 1912), p. 487.

[10]J. Toutain, "Sacerdos—Rome," *Dictionnaire des antiquites Grecques et Romaines*, ed. Daremberg et Saglio (Paris: Hachette, n.d.), IV, 945. Cited Daremberg-Saglio.

[11]Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 490. Cf. A. D. Nock, "Intrare sub Iugum," *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 2, p. 108.

[12]Wilhelm Liebenam, *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des Roemischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1890), pp. 199, 202.

Greek Magistrates

The Athenian constitution of the fourth centry B.C., for which the most evidence is available, may be taken as representative of Greek democracy.[13]

All important magistrates were selected either by Lot-taking (*klerosis*) or by Election (*cheirotonia*). The Lot was used for those positions the management of which every citizen possessed the ability, and the Lot-taking emphasized that aspect of democracy which provides every one with the right to be chosen. *Cheirotonia* was voting by a show of hands, and the Election emphasized the right of every citizen to decide who was qualified to serve in certain specialized tasks.

The Election of officials occurred in an ordinary meeting of the Assembly. The meeting would open with prayer and sacrifice. The preliminary decision of the Council to place the Election on the agenda of the meeting of the Assembly would be presented. The supervision of the Election was in the hands of the nine chairmen (*proedroi*) for the day. The list of candidates was supplied either by the Nomination of friends or by announcement. There might be a preliminary vote to decide to proceed with the Election. At the appropriate time the Herald called for a show of hands for the respective candidates. The votes were counted and the report of the results was given and these results were ratified as a legal vote. Both were the assignment of the nine *proedroi.*

A distinctive feature of entrance into office in Athens was the Formal Scrutiny (*dokimasia*) which every official had to undergo at the first of the civil year. The Scrutiny according to the law covered only the formal qualifications for the office, but in practice must have often covered the whole private and public life of the candidate. The Scrutiny was conducted by the presiding officer of the Assembly or of the law-court.

Next came the Oath-taking (*horkos*) by which the newly selected magistrate bound himself to rule according to the laws and to the best of his ability.[14]

Upon entrance into office Entrance-sacrifices were brought.[15] The details of the performance are obscure, but the idea seems to have

---

[13]Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* in the edition of J. E. Sandys (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912) is the principal original source. Important studies include Georg Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920) and for this article, Markos A. Siotis, "Die Klassische und die Christliche Cheirotonie in ihrem Verhaeltnis," *Theologia* (Greek), XX-XXII (1949-50).

[14]The Scrutiny and the Oath are described by Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 55.

[15]Busolt, *op. cit.*, pp. 517, 518. The clearest statement comes from Demosthenes, XIX. 190.

been that one did not begin an important task without recourse to the gods, Divine Invocation.[16]

Greece differed from Rome in the extensive use of the Lot in filling magistracies. When Election was performed in Greece, the basic voting unit was the individual, and not a group. The Formal Scrutiny had a distinctive role in the Greek appointive process. Although Greece too had its sacrificial Invocation of the gods and Oath-taking, the ceremonies lack the elaboration and legal precision characteristic of Rome.

Greek Priesthoods

In reference to the method of their selection Greek priesthoods may be placed in three categories: those following the civil analogy and filled by Election or Lot-taking, those closely connected with a given family and acquired by Inheritance, and those purchased.[17]

The ordinary civic priests were chosen by Election or by Lot-taking and served for one year. The use of lots was more common and could be interpreted as permitting the deity to choose his own minister.[18] The methods of voting and taking lots could be combined—the field being narrowed by one means and the actual choice made by the other.[19]

Any number of circumstances may have brought a given family into especially close relationship with a given deity so that the service of that deity was reserved to members of the family; this was true even of civic cults. The rule of succession varied from family to family.

During the Hellenistic period in Asia Minor and the Islands there was a strong development of the practice of the purchase of priesthoods.[20] Purchase was sometimes combined with other methods of selection. The vendor was always the State.

The entrance into the functions of office by a newly chosen priest would be marked in some way with a certain ceremony, but "in classical antiquity most priesthoods did not, it seems, involve any solemn

---

[16]J. A. Hild, Daremberg-Saglio, II, 504.

[17]W. J. Woodhouse, "Priest, Priesthood (Greek)," *ERE*, X, 305; Ph.-E. Legrand, "Sacerdos—Grece," Daremberg-Saglio, IV, 938; Paul Stengel, *Die Griechischen Kultusaltertuemer* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920), pp. 44-46.

[18]"As to the priests, we shall entrust it to the god himself to ensure his own good pleasure, by committing their appointment to the divine chance of the lot." Plato, *Laws* 759 C.

[19]A good example is supplied by Cicero, *Against Verres* ii.162. The comparison to Acts 1 is striking. The people narrowed the field by passing on the qualifications and then the divine choice was expressed through the Lot.

[20]Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* ("Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft"; Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1950), Zweiter Band, 74, 77ff. F. Sokolowski, "Partnership in the Lease of Cults in Greek Antiquity," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 50 (April, 1957), pp. 133ff.

ordination or investiture."[21] Some Attic inscriptions mention Entrance-sacrifices. Priests of certain cults were also admitted by a form of initiation. At such a time the priest may have assumed any insignia of his office. The very paucity of the evidence is perhaps an indication that nothing unusual attached to the assumption of a priestly position in Greek religion.

Greek Associations

A special mode of appointment met with in the private associations of the Greeks is the Designation of an official by another, but this usually occurred only in the appointment of a lesser functionary by a higher officer. More common were appointments by Lot or by Election.[22] The statutes of Greek guilds in Egypt during the imperial period open with an account of the Election of a president whose term was to run for a single year.[23] (Apparently Roman imperialism had not submerged local democratic traditions.) About the manner of Election by the members little information occurs, but the indications are that it was commonly by a show of hands.[24]

The installation of officers is spoken of in wholly general phrases in the overwhelming majority of cases. An Oath was taken in Attic colleges at the entrance into the association or into one of its offices. Sacrifices accompanied the entrance into office in some cases, as they did the laying down of office and all other important occasions.[25] The Oath-taking and Entrance-sacrifices are features that other phases of Greek life would lead us to expect, but the evidence is not sufficient to permit a generalization.

The Jewish Background

Priests

The account of the installation of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 gives the fullest description of installation to the priestly office. The seven-day ceremony, in the presence of the people, included the following elements: ceremonial washing, Investiture with the garments of the priesthood, Chrismation, and the performance of certain sacrifices which were accompanied by the placing of blood on the right ear, thumb, and the

---

[21]A. D. Nock, *loc. cit.*

[22]Franz Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens, Preisschriften von der Fuerstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig,* Vol. XXXVIII (Leipzig: B. H. Teubner, 1909), pp. 416, 417. A good introduction to the Greek associations in English is found in chapter 3 of Marcus Tod, *Sidelights on Greek History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1932).

[23]A. E. R. Boak, "The Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* Vol. LXVIII (1937), p. 213.

[24]Poland, *loc. cit.*

[25]*Ibid.,* pp. 418, 499, 253.

great toe and by the sprinkling of blood and oil on the person and garments of the new priest. There are several indications that the Investiture and the Chrismation were the basic elements in the ceremony (Ex. 29:9c, 29; 40:14f; Num. 20:26-28).

One set of passages suggests that all priests were anointed, whereas another set implies that Chrismation was limited to the high priest. That all priests received the oil is indicated by Exodus 28: 40f; 30:30; 40:14f (but, do the latter two passages refer to the sons of Aaron as successors in the high priesthood?); Lev. 7:36; 10:7; and Num. 3:3. Nevertheless, the term the "anointed priest" seems to be a special term for the high priest (but this interpretation is not necessarily demanded in Lev. 4), and anointing is given as the mark of Aaron's successor in Lev. 6:22.[26] Apparently all priests could be spoken of as "anointed," but the "anointed priest" *par excellence* was the high preist. The account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 does in fact make a distinction in the manner of the application of the oil. It is only sprinkled on Aaron's sons (and also on Aaron himself), whereas it is poured on Aaron's head (cf. Lev. 21:10; Ps. 133:2).

Several Pentateuchal statements indicate that Chrismation was to be used in the appointment of each new priest (Ex. 29:29f; 40:14f). The virtual silence of sources outside the Old Testament leaves the question of what ceremony if any was in use in later times uncertain. Furthermore, it would appear that in the latter days of the Temple the high priest was no longer (or not always) anointed, for the Mishnah knows of high priests introduced to their office through the ceremony of Investiture.[27] The continuation of Chrismation into Hellenistic times is indicated by Daniel 9:26 and 2 Maccabees 1:10. The Hasmonaean priest-kings, precisely because of the question of their legitimacy, would hardly have omitted the rite. Rather any abolition of Chrismation would have come in Herodian-Roman times.[28]

---

[26]For an analysis of the problem see Wolf Baudissin, "Priests and Levites," *Dictionary of the Bible* (Ed. James Hastings; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), Vol. IV, p. 83.

[27]Such is the understanding of *Horajoth* iii.4 by Emil Schuerer, *Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (Vierte Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1907), II, 284. For the Mishnah the English translation of Herbert Danby (London: Oxford University Press, 1933) has been used.

Only Investiture and Inaugural Usurpation in the installation of a new high priest are discussed in *bYoma* 12a, b. [Unless otherwise stated, references to the Babylonian Talmud are based on the edition of I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1935-52.] Josephus, *Ant.* XX.i, would indicate that Investiture was constitutive in making the high priest.

[28]So Schuerer, *loc. cit.*

Christianity's break with the priestly traditions of the Old Testament is well symbolized by the absence of Chrismation in ordination until well into the Middle ages.[29]

The accounts of Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8 use words from the root *male'* ("to fill" or "to appoint") in reference to the installation of Aaron and his sons. The full form of the expression, "to fill the hand," (Judg. 17:5, 12) seems to have been the literal terminology for the installation of a priest. What was the hand filled with? The most attractive explanation, based on the "fill offering" of the Exodus and Leviticus texts, is that there was a handing over of sacrificial portions (Porrection) to the new priest. Consecration was meant thus to express that the priest was empowered to lay these pieces upon the altar, or, as the case may be, to take them for himself from the sacrifice as perquisites.[30] Leviticus 8:27 would lend support to this view. In most Old Testament passages, however, the word has lost any specific sense and means only "appoint."

Kings

Some data on the installation of kings is preserved in the stories of Saul and David in the books of Samuel. First, Saul was appointed privately by Samuel as an expression of the divine choice (1 Sam. 10:1). The public selection took place by Lot in an assembly of the people (1 Sam. 10:20f). David, also, was designated to the kingship by Chrismation, and in this case the act was connected with the coming of the Spirit upon him (1 Sam. 16:13f). Chrismation is mentioned in later cases of disputed succession.

Coronation is mentioned (2 Kings 11:12), but Chrismation seems to have been the rite with comparable significance to the coronations of pagan kings.

Prophets

By the nature of the prophetic office a regular mode of appointment would not be expected. As endowed with the Spirit of God, prophets could be spoken of as "anointed," but there is some question whether this was ever literally done.[31] In the Elijah-Elisha stories the mantle of the master was passed on to his successor (1 Kings 19:19; 2 Kings 2:6-15). [32]

---

[29]Gerald Ellard, *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A.D.* (Cambridge: Medieval Academy of America, 1933), pp. 7-13, 104, finds the first evidence in the 8th century. At baptism there was a Chrismation at an early period, and Tertullian connects *this* ceremony with admission to the priesthood (*de Bapt.* 7).

[30]Baudissin, *loc. cit.*, p. 70.

[31]In 1 Kings 19:16 Elijah is told to anoint Elisha but no record is preserved of his doing so. Ps. 105:15 has reference to the Patriarchs but may imply an anointing of prophets (but with the Holy Spirit?). Isa. 61:1 is metaphorical.

[32]In *The Ascension of Isaiah*, according to the text adopted in the edition of R. H. Charles (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900), p. 43, there is a reference to imposition of hands on prophets: "And they [forty prophets] had come to salute him and to hear his words.

→

Elders, Judges, and Rabbis—Old Testament Precedents

Gaster, in speaking of Jewish ordination, has observed that behind this institution lies a chapter of Jewish history which has not yet been elucidated—the appointment of judges.[33] The Old Testament passages speaking of the appointment of "judges and officers" in the land[34] give no indication of a mode of installation. The same applies to the elders, whose status appears to go back to the early tribal days of the Hebrews. The selection of seventy out of the elders to assist Moses is related in Num. 11:16ff, a number which apparently was older in usage (Ex. 24:1). The Sanhedrin of New Testament times was regarded as patterned on the institution of the seventy elders around Moses.[35]

The judges and the elders of Israel contributed to the picture of the rabbis in normative Judaism. The absence of a method of ordination in the texts relating to these people was supplied from the story of the appointment of Joshua in Numbers 27:15ff.[36] Deuteronomy 34:9 seems to look back to this incident, but the point immediately leaps to view that in Numbers Moses imposes hands on Joshua because he is a man "in whom is spirit" whereas in Deuteronomy Joshua has the "spirit of wisdom" because Moses has imposed his hands on him. Jewish commentators have seen no incongruity in the passages and have taken the "spirit of wisdom" (*i.e.* wisdom) as an added gift distinct from the "spirit" Joshua already possessed.[37] Co-

[33]M. Gaster, "Ordination (Jewish)," *ERE* IX, 552.

[34]Deut. 16:18-20; 17:9; Ex. 18:13ff; 1 Chron. 23:4; 26:29; 2 Chron. 19:5-7.

[35]*Sanhedrin* i.6. There is no possibility of the two bodies possessing historical continuity (but local elders did have judicial functions —Deut. 21:18-23). The Chronicler notes in the time of Jehoshaphat the appointment of a council of Levites, priests, and heads of families in Jerusalem to decide disputed cases (2 Chron. 19:8ff). It should be noted that the Mishnah passage speaks of the lesser councils of twenty-three elders in other cities, besides the great council in Jerusalem.

[36]As the appointment of Joshua and of the seventy elders served as precedents in Judaism, so the appointment of Joshua and the consecration of the Levites (Num. 8) are echoed in Acts 6 and 13. David Daube, *New eTstament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 237, 239. A. M. Farrer's chapter on the "Ministry in the New Testament," in *The Apostolic Ministry* (K. E. Kirk, ed.; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1947) develops the analogies, but hardly establishes his theories from them.

[37]Cf. J. Newman, *Semikhah* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950), p. 3. The one exception is the *Midrash Rabbah* to Numbers, xv.25 (H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, ed.; London: Soncino Press, 1939), which quotes the two passages side by side and seems to identify the "spirit of wisdom" with the "honor" of Moses and with the "spirit" placed on the elders in Num. 11.

And that he might place his hands upon them, and that they might prophesy and that he might hear their prophecy" (6:4f). Charles ascribes this passage to a first century Christian work. The significance of the act seems to be a benediction—cf. Joseph Coppens, *L'imposition des mains* (Paris, 1925), p. 3.

inciding with this view is the added consideration that the "because" in Deuteronomy 34:9 may be regarded as stating the evidence for and not the means of Joshua's wisdom.

The central feature of the Moses-Joshua episode is the Imposition of hands. The word used for the action of Moses is *samakh*, "to lean (one's hands) upon somebody or something." This word is to be distinguished from *sim* and *shith*, "to place (one's hands)," which are the words used where a benediction is concerned (as notably in Gen. 48:14ff). The Septuagint has translated both *samakh* and *sim* by *epitithenai* (used for all types of Impositions of hands in the New Testament also) and *shith* by *epiballein*.[38] The placing of one's hands on another in benediction was accompanied by the spoken word usually in the form of prayer.[39] *Samakh* was a different act, meaning to lean so as to exert pressure.[40]

Samakh is used of witinesses laying their hands on the blasphemer who is to be stoned (Lev. 24:14; cf. Susannah 34), of the person who brings an animal for sacrifice leaning upon it (Lev. *passim*), and of the people consecrating the Levites (Num. 8:10).

Although not significant in Jewish ordination, the consecration of the Levites was important as a precedent in early Christianity. Since the Levites replaced the first-born, the narrative speaks of their setting apart in sacrificial terms. All of the Israelites (or the elders as representatives—?) laid hands on the Levites. Since this was the exclusion of a whole tribe, it was a non-repeatable act.

Efforts to find a common significance behind these usages of the act have not been notably successful. Elderenbosch has emphasized the ideas of solidarity and community, the giving of oneself so as to establish an identity, in the imposition of hands in the Old Testament.[41]. This approach sounds good, but on application to the specific instances suffers the limitation of not being able to make a contribution to their understanding except in generalities. The interpretation in terms of "transference"[42] has the same defect. It is easy to set up a general category, but a generalization does not aid in interpreting specific passages from which the generalization is drawn. If such diverse qualities as one's sins and one's gratitude could be transferred to the sin and peace offerings respectively, the act was hardly ambiguous. Moreover, there was no obvious transfer

---

[38]Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-229.

[39]Eduard Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spaetjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 16.

[40]Cf. Amos 5:19. This meaning lay at the root of a Rabbinic controversy about whether an animal could be brought for sacrifice on a Sabbath or a festival, since work was involved—*bChagigah* 16b. Although the Rabbis preserved the tradition of the action, it is to be noted that in the discussion the exertion of pressure was no longer derived from the meaning of *samakh*.

[41]P. A. Elderenbosch, *De Oplegging der Handen* (Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1953), chapter III.

[42]E.g. Johannes Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1911), p. 139.

in the dedication of the Levites. Daube concludes that by pressing upon a person or animal one poured his personality into him or it, making a substitute.[43] But the case of the witnesses does not fit this frame of thinking, nor does the offering of a sacrifice. If the animal was a substitute, it represented the offerer in only one aspect (his sins or his feeling of gratitude); therefore, the distinction with *sim* breaks down, for this word is said by Daube to indicate the transference of something other than or less than the whole personality.

Lohse is probably right in concluding that there is no unified explanation for the Old Testament impositions of hands.[44] Indeed there is no necessity that there should be. Perhaps originally the act had a common root, but it could very easily acquire various connotations in different contexts. Furthermore, there is no basis for Behm's contention that a gesture must be unambiguous and have a definite meaning in a religion.[45] The history of religions is replete with actions that continue with a changed interpretation, or indeed with no significance save the sacredness which age imparts.

There is some confusion whether one or both hands were ordinarily employed in the rite. In the case of sacrificial animals where the subject is singular the singular "hand" is always used except in Leviticus 16:21 (where the consonantal text is singular but the context demands the plural). The rabbis, however, always spoke of the action in the plural, "hands." The evidence is more confused where persons are concerned. In Numbers 27 God tells Moses to impose his "hand" on Joshua; Moses is said to have imposed his "hands" on him. In the New Testament the plural is used in the great majority of cases, even of the action of one person. It would seem that no distinction was made, and in later times the practice gravitated toward the use of both hands.[46]

Elders and Rabbis—the Rabbinic Literature

The Babylonian Talmud uses words from the *samakh* root for ordination, whereas the Palestinian Talmud uses *minnuy*, a general word for any kind of installation into an office. We are warranted in taking both terms as having the same meaning.[47] Lohse suggests

---

[43]Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 226f.

[44]*Op. cit.*, p. 25.

[45]Behm, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[46]Philo, contrary to Old Testament usage, in speaking of a person's sacrifices says that he lays on "hands" (*Spec. Leg.* i.203). The Septuagint, although generally following the number of Hebrew, sometimes changes the singular to the plural, as it does in Lev. 3:2, 8, 13. The plural is the common form in Greek Christian writers, but the singular is more often utilized by Latin writers (who generally show considerable indebtedness to the literal text of the Old Testament). See the references in P. Galtier, "Imposition des mains," *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, VII, 135.

[47]H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Muenchen: C. H. Beck, 1920), II, 648. (Cited Strack-Billerbeck.)

that because *semikah* can have more than one usage *semikuth* came to be used exclusively for ordination,[48] but this is not certain. *Semikuth* is brought into conjunction with the *semikah zekenim* in three passages. Although Strack-Billerbeck take the latter to refer to "ordination to be elders,"[49] it seems better to take the phrase as equivalent to the imposition of the elders' hands in connection with a sacrifice for the sins of the community (Lev. 4:15).[50]

The halakic midrash to Numbers understands the installation of Joshua as an example of Rabbinic ordination:

> God said to Moses: Give Joshua an interpreter (*i.e.* make Joshua a lecturing teacher at whose side an interpreter stands), so that he questions, and lectures, and makes decisions as long as you still live; if you depart from the world, the Israelites may not say: During the life of his teacher (Moses) he gave no decisions, and now he does. Moses had Joshua to stand up from the ground (on which he had sat before him up to that time as his student) and he set him before himself on the seat (as enjoying equal privileges) . . . .[51]

A passage from the Palestinian Talmud describing the changes in the ordaining authority provides a good framework for the history of Jewish ordination during the early centuries of the Christian era:

> Originally, every one (*i.e.* every teacher) ordained his own pupils, thus R. Johanan b. Zakkai ordained R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, R. Joshua ordained R. Akiba, R. Akiba ordained R. Meir and R. Simeon. They were anxious to honor this house (the house of the Nasi) and declared that if the Beth Din ordained without the approval of the Nasi the ordination was not valid, but if a Nasi ordained without the knowledge of the Beth Din the Semikah was valid; then again they made a regulation that ordination should be performed with the mutual approval of the Beth Din and the Nasi.[52]

With the mention of R. Johanan b. Zakkai (d. about A.D. 80) this passage gives the first case of ordination in which names are recorded. The Babylonian Talmud preserves a story of a scholar ordaining his students during the war under Hadrian.[53]

The Palestinian Talmud is probably right in saying that the change from an individual teacher to the Nasi ("Patriarch" or "President") was made to do honor to his house. Most scholars ascribe this change to the time after the Hadrianic war, presumably under R. Gamaliel II, by A.D. 140. This centralization may have been part of the re-organization in those troubled times. The limitation of Nasi's authority so that the approval of the council was required is

---

[48]*Op. cit.*, pp. 28f.

[49]*Op. cit.*, II, 653.

[50]So Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 28 and Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 3f. With the precedent of the Biblical text and the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin* i.3) before them it does not seem possible that the Talmudists reversed the usage.

[51]*Sifre Numbers* 27:18, 20 from the quotation in Strack-Billerbeck, II, 647f.

[52]*pSanhedrin* 1, 19a, 43, following the translation of Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 13f.

[53]*bSanhedrin* 13b-14a.

usually ascribed to the third century at the time of R. Judah II.[54]

The essential part of early Rabbinic ordinations appears to have been the Imposition of hands. However, Rabbinic literature preserves no express mention of this rite in ordination earlier than about A.D. 380, and here in a context denying its necessity but apparently indicating that it was formerly so regarded.[55] The evidences adduced in Strack-Billerbeck seem conclusive that the Imposition of hands was performed and was the center of the rite of ordination: the name itself which is based on the Old Testament word used in the imposition of hands; the explanations of Moses' installation of Joshua which is interpreted according to the views held of a scholar's ordination; and the later denials of the necessity of this act, implying a previous practice.[56] We may add another argument: the connection made by the rabbis between ordination and the imposition of hands in sacrifice.

Verbal Naming later replaced the practice of Imposition of hands. As Newman argues, the question of why a change was made points to the time when the change was made. The Imposition of hands was dropped in the time of Hadrian when ordination was restricted to the Nasi. Ordination was no longer an individual but a communal affair.[57] The new circumstances and the new ceremony called for a new name, and thus *minnuy* became the usual term in Palestine.

While ordination was performed by Imposition of hands, the act would have involved leaning upon the ordained so as to exert pressure.[58] When appointment by Naming came into use, the essential feature was the giving of the title "Rabbi." The sources also suggest an Investiture and Inaugural Usurpation such as giving a public discourse.[59]

There was a requirement that three ordained men be present for conferring ordination on another, but the rule itself puzzled the Talmudic interpreters.[60] The accounts of ordination make it clear that only one was the principal, so the other two must have been assistants or witnesses.

What was the meaning attached to ordination in Judaism? The leadership and authority of the rabbis were especially associated

---

[54]Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 19f.

[55]"R. Aha, the son of Raba, asked R. Ashi: Is ordination effect by the literal laying on of hands?—[No,] he answered; it is by the conferring of the degree: He is designated by the title of Rabbi and granted the authority to adjudicate cases of kenas" (fines). *bSanhedrin* 13b.

[56]Strack-Billerbeck, II, 654.

[57]Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-110. Cf. afso J. Z. Lauterbach, "Ordination," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905), IX, 428-430.

[58]Daube interprets the *Sifre* on Numbers 27:23 as likening the imposition of hands to pressing upon a full vessel (or to make a full vessel), *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[59]Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-123.

[60]*bSanhedrin* 13a, b.

with judicial questions arising from the Law. This association points to the origin of rabbinic ordinations in the judges and in the greater and lesser Sanhedrins of pre-Christian times. Newman devotes a whole chapter to the "exclusive jurisdiction of the ordained."[61] An examination of this list of prerogatives of the ordained scholar in Judaism is instructive: They settled financial disputes, inflicted fines, established the calendar, released the first-born animal for profane use by reason of disqualifying blemishes, annulled vows, and originally inflicted corporal and capital punishment.

The impression of the ordained rabbi as a religious judge is strengthened by two further considerations. First, there is the principle, "There is no ordination outside Palestine," meaning that ordination could not be conferred outside the holy land.[62] The very existence of such a regulation indicates that ordination was rooted in the juridical life of the Jewish people in their homeland and was not a spiritual principle necessary to the religious life of the Diaspora. That the Babylonian exilarch (*resh galutha*) granted authorizations, sometimes called "ordinations," does not change the principle, rather it speaks of the legal status attained by Jewry in that region. The terminology for ordination was never changed in Babylonia because ordination never had its full meaning there. The second consideration is the granting of part and conditional ordinations.[63] Ordinarily, ordination conferred an equal status, and when a teacher ordained his student, this would have been the case.[64] But authorizations to decide ritual questions or act as a judge can be limited to certain cases or certain times. In cases of full ordination the ordination was apparently considered irrevocable.[65]

Other concepts besides the juridical one were associated with the rabbinate, but we have dwelt on the legal aspect because it indicates clearly the difference between Christian and Jewish ordination. Christian ordination had no comparable legal or juridical purpose. Ehrhardt calls attention to two subsidiary differences between Rabbinic and Christian ordination. The former required the presence of three, and this is a later feature of Christian ordination for which there is no early evidence. Moreover, Rabbinic ordination conferred an equal status, something not true of all Christian ordinations. A related problem to the latter would be the renewed laying on of hands in episcopal consecration of one already a presbyter—this would have been contrary to a Jewish rule against repeating the act.[66]

Ehrhardt claims that in early Judaism the transference of the

---

[61]*Op. cit.*, pp. 24-64.

[62]*bSanhedrin* 14a; *pBikkurim* 3, 65d (quoted in Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 103).

[63]Bases for these are discussed in *bSanhedrin* 5a and *pChagigah* 1, 76a.

[64]See Strack-Billerbeck, II, 647, on *Sifre* Numbers 27:18.

[65]*bSanhedrin* 30b. Cf. Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

[66]Arnold Ehrhardt, "Jewish and Christian Ordination," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, V(1954), pp. 132, 134f.

Spirit was admitted and was connected with the Imposition of hands.[67] This is far from a general opinion among scholars. Davies states as follows: "It is precarious also to assume that Rabbinic ordination by the laying on of hands in the first century was meant to signify the transmission of the Holy Spirit."[68] Daube also declares that the imparting of the Spirit was not Rabbinic ordination.[69] The Rabbinic comments on Numbers 27:18 and Deuteronomy 34:9 would appear to be conclusive evidence for the negative. The only passage this writer has found which would connect the Imposition of hands with the giving of the Spirit is a quite late homiletic midrash on Num. 27.[70] Otherwise, Jewish writers stress that in Numbers 11 God made the transfer.[71] Numbers 27 has no transfer of the Spirit, and in the interpretations the emphasis is on the "honor" Joshua received in being designated Moses' successor.[72] Significantly, little is made of the Deuteronomy passage which does make a connection between spirit and the Imposition of hands. What little is said stresses that Joshua had, not Spirit, but wisdom from Moses. The "spirit of wisdom" passed down among Jewish scholars was that which a student learned from his teacher.

It has been noted above that at ordination the title of "rabbi" was given. There is evidence to suggest that originally "elder" (*zaqen*) was the status conferred in ordination. Lauterbach asserts that persons ordained to the Sanhedrin bore the title of *zaqen*, and he gives as evidence a passage in *bSanhedrin* 14a where this word is referred to the ordained.[73] Furthermore, the Talmudic statements which link the laying on of the hands of the elders in a communal sacrifice with ordination imply that "elders" are involved in both cases. The comments on Numbers 11 make the transition from the "elders" of the text to ordained teachers directly.[74] One of the texts denying ordination "outside the Land" speaks of it as ordination of

---

[67]*Ibid.*, p. 137.

[68]W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Second ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 213.

[69]*Op. cit.*, p. 241.

[70]*Midrash Rabbah, Numbers* xv. 25.

[71]Not even Philo, *de Gigantibus* 24f, is an exception to this, although it is the main passage to which Ehrhardt appeals, in spite of his skepticism about Philo's value for views held by Palestinian Jews (*op. cit.*, p. 131). Justin, *Dial.* 49 confuses Num. 11:17 with Num. 27:18 and Deut. 34:9 in a way not found in Jewish sources. Nevertheless, even if Justin is reproducing some rabbi's exegesis, the transfer of Moses' spirit to Joshua is not ascribed to the Imposition of hands but to a separate act by God.

[72]"Authority" is the happy rendering of the *RSV*. Both the Old Testament text and the Rabbinic interpretations show that the transfer involves Moses' authority or prestige (the Latin *auctoritas* would seem exactly to represent the Hebrew "honor" or "majesty" in this instance).

[73]Lauterbach, *loc. cit.*, p. 428.

[74]*Sifre* Numbers 11:16 (quoted in Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 42).

elders.[75] Two passages referring to the later ordination by Naming speak of this as "appointment to be elders."[76] The term "elder" (indicating dignity more than age) forges another link between ordination and the judicial aspects of Jewish life, for the term was the designation for the members of the councils in each community. It would appear to have been an early title for the ordained that enjoyed a revival in later times. The term, "rabbi," on the other hand, is first used as a *title* in reference to the disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai.[77] The Gospels show "rabbi" as a respectful form of address to a teacher, but are an evidence against its usage at that time for ordained teachers. "Rabbi" apparently acquired official connotations only at the time we also hear of the first ordinations performed by individual teachers.

Can Rabbinic ordination be traced to the time before A.D. 70? There is point in Newman's observation that the Talmud would not have tolerated any innovations such as R. Ashi's decision that laying on of hands by the qualifier was not necessary, or the introduction of part-ordination, if the Old Testament story of Moses and Joshua had been considered binding in all its details.[78] His doubts raise the more important question whether ordination by a scholar through the Imposition of hands would, or could, have been abandoned if it was an institution of long standing.[79] Moreover, there seems no reason why *individual* ordination could not have spread outside Palestine, and, if it was an old institution, the probability is that it would have done so.

In the face of these presumptions an effort has been made to break through the wall in our evidence raised at the time of the Jewish revolt, A.D. 66-70. Lohse has made the most persistent effort of recent times,[80] but his evidence has been answered by Ehrhardt.[81] We are left with no clear evidence for Rabbinic ordination before 70 and a presumption against it.

Elders and the Sanhedrin

The term "elder" offers the one solid indication of ordination in earlier times. Ehrhardt has advanced a thesis which we would like to elaborate further. The main points of this thesis are as follows: ordination before 70 was the solemn ritual of admission to the Jerusalem Sanhedrin; in the time of Jesus the main rite in Jewish ordi-

---

[75] *pBikkurim* 3.

[76] *pMegilloth* 1, 72b and *pChagigah*, 76c in Strack-Billerbeck, II, 655.

[77] G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), III, 15.

[78] *Op. cit.*, p. 5. Newman notes the differences between the Moses-Joshua episode and Rabbinic ordination.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 104-110. Newman points out that the proscription of ordination by Hadrian mentioned in Rabbinic sources would not account for a failure to resume Imposition of hands.

[80] *Op. cit.*, especially p. 43.

[81] *Op. cit.*, pp. 130ff.

nation was not the Imposition of hands but a Solemn Seating; the Imposition of hands rose to prominence in the troubled times, 70-135, when the precedent of Numbers 27 had to be stressed against Numbers 11 in the need for private ordination.[82] Although evidence is lacking for ordination of rabbis by Imposition of hands before 70, the same is not true for ordination to the Sanhedrin by Solemn Seating.

It is surprising that earlier investigators have not been impressed that all of the earliest descriptions of ordination make the key feature of the Seating of the ordinand on the teaching chair. The *Sifre* to Numbers 27,[83] which was quoted earlier, says nothing about the Imposition of hands except as it appears in the citation of the Biblical text. The central feature of the description is Moses raising Joshua up and Seating him on a chair. The same description holds true for the passage cited by Lohse[84] for support of Jewish ordination going back to pre-Christian times, Assumption of Moses xii.2. Discussing the appointment of Joshua, the text says, "And Moses took his hands and raised him into the seat before him."[85] Ehrhardt also finds support for Solemn Seating being the central concept of Jewish ordination in the words of Jesus about the scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23:2, they "sit in Moses' seat."[86] Lohse also cites texts from the *Sifre* on Deuteronomy where *yashabh* (in the form "cause to be seated") is used of ordination.[87]

Probably the most significant passage on Jewish ordination is a statement from the Mishnah which should serve to certify the rest of the evidence.[88]

> The Sanhedrin was arranged like the half of a round threshing-floor so that they all might see one another. Before them stood the two scribes of the judges. . . .
>
> Before them sat three rows of disciples of the Sages, and each knew his proper place. If they needed to appoint another as judge, they appointed him from the first row, and one from the second row came into the first row, and one from the third

---

[82]*Ibid.*, pp. 125-138.

[83]This work is part of the Halakic Midrash by the Tannaim to which Moore gives the first importance for determining second century Jewish thought, especially as that thought preserved older traditions. *Op. cit.*, I, 133.

[84]*Op. cit.*, p. 30.

[85]From R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913). Charles dates the work in the early part of the first century.

[86]The background of the teaching and judging chairs of the Sanhedrin favors a non-eschatological interpretation of Matt. 19:28.

[87]Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 33. Cf. *pBikkurim* 3, 65d.

[88]Again we have a second century source which collects earlier traditional material. Lohse (*op. cit.*, pp. 30f) says this passage must refer to the time of centralization in the second century. The extent to which contemporary material is included in the Mishnah is debatable. It is more reasonable to take this passage for what it purports to be; a description of the Sanhedrin that was prior to the destruction of 70.

row came into the second; and they chose yet another from the congregation and set him in the third row. He did not sit in the place of the former, but he sat in the place that was proper for him.[89]

Samakh is the verb translated "appoint," and it is distinguished in the passage from "chose." The technical meaning "ordain" would seem to be definite. This word may further suggest a laying on of hands; what is significant is that taking the appropriate seat on the Sanhedrin represented one's admission to that body.

Apparently the same procedure was employed for the lesser Sanhedrins, or councils of judges. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 17b) the number one hundred twenty is given as the minimum population of a city in order that it may qualify for a Sanhedrin. In arriving at this number the commentator first counts the twenty-three members of a minor Sanhedrin, and then lists three rows of twenty-three who must sit before the council. There is no need to carry the arithmetic further; this much shows that the major Sanhedrin was the pattern for the lesser ones and presumably vacancies would be filled by both bodies in the same way as outlined in the Mishnah.

It may well be that Imposition of hands was part of the ceremony of ordination to a Sanhedrin. It may even have been that rabbis used the rite in the private "graduation exercises" of their pupils before A.O. 70. The evidence, however, is lacking. Ehrhardt's statement that "private ordination was, at any rate, not officially recognized before A.D. 70, but was a transient phase in the troubled times between A.D. 70 and 135, and not the true origin of rabbinical ordination," is correct. The juridical nature of Rabbinic ordination is explained by its intention to continue the Sanhedrin. The Jewish background gives prominence to an act often overlooked in discussions of ordination—Solemn Seating.

Community and Synagogue Officers in the Diaspora

The liturgical functions of the Jewish synagogue, at home and abroad, were in the hands of a "chief of the synagogue" (*rosh hakeneseth, archisynagogos*) and a "servant" of the synagogue (*chazan, hyperetes*). No information exists in regard to their selection and installation.[90]

Distinct from these cult officials were the community rulers. At the legal head of Palestinian communities were local sanhedrins whose members were ordained and wore the title *zaqen*. Although a certain variety appears, non-Palestinian Jewish communities also had a collegiate body in charge of their administrative affairs. Inscriptions from the diaspora show a multiplicity of functionaries patterned after the officials of the Greek associations but keeping within the framework of Palestinian models. Jewry in Rome may be taken as

[89]*Sanhedrin* iv. 3, 4.

[90]Samuel Krauss, *Synagogale Altertuemer* (Berlin: Benjamin Harz, 1922), pp. 114-130.

representative inasmuch as there is more evidence from Rome and we have the benefit of the studies of J. B. Frey for the city.[91]

Each Jewish community at Rome was governed by a council of elders,[92] the *gerousia,* presided over by the *gerousiarch. Presbyteroi* do not appear to be mentioned in Rome,[93] so the idea has been presented that each member of the *gerousia* was called *archon.*[94] Frey, however, argues that *archons* were the executive committee of the *gerousia.*[95]

No installation ceremony is known for any officials of the Jewish communities. The only means of selection which is attested is that of Election by the community. The Jewish *archons* were elected for a year by all the community in the month of September at the Feast of Tabernacles.[96]

The later patriarchs sought to maintain some control over Jewish communities through their apostles (*sheluchim*). Their introduction into discussions about the ministry of the church necessitate a word here.[97] There is no evidence for Jewish apostles of the patriarchs before the second century; neither is there evidence that they were ordained nor any reason to suppose they would be.[98] There was no place for a laying on of hands in the sending out of the *shaliach.*[99]

Functionaries in the Qumran Community

Although study is producing a fair clear picture of the organiza-

---

[91]"Les Communautes Juives a Rome," *Recherches de Science Religieuse,* XXI (1931), pp. 136ff. We will follow this article in the references, but the same material is included in Frey's introduction to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum,* I, lxviii-cxi.

[92]Frey, *loc. cit.,* p. 136. There is no mention of a supreme *gerousia* at Rome. Frey, pp. 161ff, answers the arguments which have been advanced for a central organization of Jewry at Rome such as Alexandria had.

[93]However, Frey gives *presbyteros* in one restored reading—*loc. cit.,* p. 138.

[94]B. S. Easton, "Jewish and Early Christian Ordination," *Anglican Theological Review,* V(March, 1923), p. 317.

[95]*Loc. cit.,* p. 139.

[96]Krauss, *op. cit.,* p. 152.

[97]The information about the *shaliach* is well summarized by T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948), p. 47.

[98]Easton, *loc. cit.,* p. 319; Lohse, *op. cit.,* pp. 62f.

[99]The mischief that may come from the blind following of scholarly authority may be seen in the influence of Rengstorf's article on "Apostle" in *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum neuen Testament* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Stuttgart: W. Kahlhammer, 1933), I, 417. Rengstorf states that Jewish apostles received an Imposition of hands on the basis of Justin, *Dial.,* 108:2, which speaks of them as "chosen and appointed (*cheirotonesantes*) men." There is no instance in the early centuries for *cheirotonein* meaning an imposition of hands—Siotis, *op. cit.,* XXI, 251, 254 (although Siotis too is awed by the authority of an article in Kittel). Rengstorf has been guilty of reading a medieval meaning into Justin's text.

tion of the Qumran community,[100] only hints exist in regard to the subject under consideration. The emphasis on an orderly structure of the community may be seen in the following passages from the Manual of Discipline:

> This is the regulation for the session of the Many: each member (shall sit) in his definite seat. The priests shall sit in the first seats, the elders in the next seats, and the rest of all the people shall sit, each in his definite seat. (vi. 8ff)
>
> They shall examine their spiritual qualities and their actions year after year, promoting one according to his insight and his perfect ways, and setting back another according to his perverseness. (v. 23f)[101]

These texts reflect in a new situation the same cycle of ideas about seating as the Mishnah *Sanhedrin* iv.4.

The idea of divine choice is strong in reference to the priests[102] and may have had a basis in the fact that the priests were the descendants of Aaron and thus divinely appointed. At any rate, the priests held a special position at Qumran simply by virtue of heredity. It is assumed that each priest was anointed.[103]

Despite the hierarchical structure there was a strong "democratic" element in the role played by the assembly in making decisions. The voice of the "Many" was especially heard in the selection of leaders. When judges (ten) were chosen for a special occasion, the whole congregation appears to have made the choice.[104] A common phrase, "the lot shall go out" (*ys' hgwrl*), was used figuratively for all decisions in which the whole body had a part.[105] In one passage it has definite reference to the selection of the leaders of the community, perhaps by an Election of the members.[106]

---

[100]Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1958), pp. 173-176.

[101]Translation by P. Wernberg-Moller, *The Manual of Discipline* ("Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah"; E. J. Brill, 1957).

[102]"God has chosen you," 1QSb v. 22 in D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, ed., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), I, 126.

[103]See the note on 1QM ix.8f by J. Van der Ploeg, "La Regle de la Guerre: Traduction et Notes," *Vetus Testamentum*, V (1955), p. 409.

[104]CD x. 4-6. Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Second Edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 49.

[105]1QS v. 2ff. Cf. Wernberg-Moller, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[106]1QSa i.13-17. Barthelemy and Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

GLOSSARY

Capitalization indicates words given a special technical meaning in the paper. The use of the small case in the text indicates either a non-technical meaning or the action in a non-ordinal context. The capitalization is not extended to verb forms and derivative words, but as much as possible these other forms of the word are used only when referring to the technical action.

Acclamation—A spontaneous, unanimous Election or Ratification; in the cry, "*Axios*" (=*Dignus*), an Acclamation became part of the liturgy.

appointment—A general word covering selection and/or installation without reference to the manner in which accomplished.

Auspication—The divination or augury performed by the new Roman office-holder in order to determine the divine attitude toward his magistracy.

Benediction—The pronouncing of a personal blessing at an ordination with a view toward dedicating the person receiving the Benediction to the service of God.

Chrismation—Anointing with oil.

Co-option—Election by members of a collegiate body to replace vacancies in their numbers, thus providing for a self-perpetuating membership.

Designation—A selection for an office made or announced by a person in authority (preserving the meaning of *designatio*).

Divine Invocation—An appeal to the gods or God for favor in an enterprise, particularly an official undertaking.

Election—A selection made by voting, particularly by the whole assembly.

Enthronement—A special form of Solemn Seating, with the chair on a raised platform and containing the ornate trappings of royalty.

Episcopal Election—A choice made by one bishop, especially of a successor.

Formal Scrutiny—Examination of the qualifications of a candidate in public and according to a set form.

Imperial Nomination—Presentation of a candidate by the emperor for Election.

Imposition of hands—Laying of hands, or a hand, on the head of the ordinand, either with or without the exertion of pressure.

Inaugural Usurpation—Assuming an office by performing its duties for the first time.

Inauguration—An auspication performed by an auger in inducting a person into office (Latin *inauguratio*).

Inheritance—Qualifying for an office through birth.

Inspired Designation—Selection of a person for religious work by a spokesman of the divine will, especially a prophet.

installation—Induction into office, however performed.

Investiture—Putting on the garments pertaining to an office and worn in its exercise.

Lot-taking—Selection by chance.

Naming—Bestowing an office by giving the name of the office, or the title carried by its holder, in a verbal proclamation.

Nomination—Proposing a name for Election.

Oath-taking—A solemn promise, supported by an appeal to the divine, marking one's entrance into office.

ordination—A general word for selection and installation, but particularly the latter, ceremonially accomplished.

Ordination—The developed sacrament of orders in Catholic Churches.

Parochial Election—An Election by all the people of a Christian community.

Porrection—Bestowal of the instruments signifying an office and/or used in its performance.

Prayer—The ordination prayer.

Presbyteral Election—Election by the presbyters of a church.

Ratification—Approval by one party to the constitutive selection performed by another.

selection—A general word for choice without reference to the manner of choosing.

Solemn Seating—The taking a seat in the chair of office.

Synodal Election—An Election by a specially assembled synod of bishops.

Origen's Evaluation of Textual Variants in the Greek Bible*

Frank Pack

As the first great textual critic produced by the church, Origen occupies a strategic position in the study of the textual criticism of the Greek Bible. His training and work in Alexandria, the center of the finest ancient textual traditions of scholarship, his great influence through the Catechetical Schools upon young scholars and church leaders of the third century, and his historical position in a period of transition from the "fluid" conditions of text transmission in the second century to the more stylized texts of later centuries all combine to emphasize his importance. Origen's work upon the text should shed light upon the condition of the Biblical writings during his life, and the processes by which "corrections" were made upon the ancient copies, as well as the theory basic to these processes. Through widspread travels that took him from Egypt, and Palestine, to Arabia, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome, he had ample opportunity to know to a considerable degree the variations in the copies used by the churches. He seems to have searched for all the available manuscripts, finding some of them in out of the way places, that these might shed additional light on textual problems.[1]

No true understanding of his textual work can be arrived at apart from his total conception of Scripture. (1) He acknowledged as a definite and unmistakable rule, that "That only is to be believed as the truth which in no way conflicts with the tradition of the church and the apostles."[2] (2) Scripture is a unity giving equal light from God for Christian guidance in both the Old and New Testaments.[3] (3) Scripture is inspired, so that whether any part looks important to the reader or not, not a detail, not a letter, "not a single tittle of the sacred Scriptures is without something of the wisdom of God."[4] It must be understood in a way that is worthy of God.[5] Yet, Origen faced the problems in Scripture with greater honesty than any other Ante-Nicene Father and found his main tool for resolving these difficulties in the allegorical method of interpretation, a method ready-made for him by his Alexandrian environment.

From his conception of Scripture, these important implications for his textual theory may be pointed out. (1) His conception of Scripture in every detail made him much more exact in his quotations of

---

*This paper was read by Dr. Pack to the American Textual Critics Seminar meeting at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 1955.

[1]Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VI:16.

[2]*De Principiis*, Preface, 2.

[3]*Commentary on John*, Bk. V, quoted in Philocalia of Origen, ch. V: 5, 6.

[4]*Philocalia*, Ch. I: 28.

[5]*De Principiis*, Bk. II: 4:4.

the text than his predecessors and much more concerned with details of grammar and word usage. (2) In view of allegorical interpretation, which made him look for the "key" to proper interpretation in some insignificant and partially hidden detail, he was greatly concerned for the accuracy of the text in the smallest details. (3) His view of tradition made him careful to exercise his criticism within the framework of the church's tradition and to use whatever might be of value for edification in the entire tradition of the church. (4) His conception of Scripture as a unity made him take similar attitudes toward textual problems in both the Old and New Testaments, so that it is possible to find some guidance from his techniques on the *Hexapla* in discovering his method of evaluating the New Testament text.

It is well known that his recognition of the attacks made by critics upon the corruptions in the texts of the Septuagint used by the churches made him prepare the *Hexapla*, using the best Alexandrian textual tradition in its preparation. He freely admitted the widespread diversity he found in his collations between the Hebrew and Greek copies in his *Epistle to Africanus*, and in this he listed a number of details. Of great interest, however, to the student of textual criticism is the method he used in the preparation of this critical text of the Old Testament. This he outlined in the *Commentary on Matthew* in connection with a discussion of diversity in the copies of the books of the New Testament.

> As regards the copies of the Old Testament we did discover through God's aid a method of curing diversity. We employed as a standard the other versions. Where a point was uncertain in the Septuagint through diversity in the copies, we made our decision from the other versions. What agreed with them we retained. Words not occcurring in the Hebrew we marked with an obelus, not daring wholly to remove them. Some words we added, marking them with asterisks, to show that we had inserted them from the other versions in conformity with the Hebrew text, though they were not found in the Septuagint.[6]

He thus made use of the versions of Aquilla, Theodotion and Symmachus for purposes of control in judging the variations between the Hebrew and Septuagint texts. The established reading became the result of the majority of the Greek versions and the Hebrew in those passages where there was diversity. He acknowledged that the church's copies had been corrupted, and he also believed that the Hebrew copies had been purposely tampered with by the Jews. However, he regarded the versions of Aquilla, Theodotion, and Symmachus as never having been corrupted and, therefore, good controls for correction.[7] He did recognize some differences among these versions in relation to the Hebrew text itself. However, this general attitude

---

[6]*Commentary on Matthew*, Bk. XV: 14. Translated by Tollinton, *Selections*, p. 110.

[7]*Commentary on John*, Bk. VI:24.

was tempered by his critical judgment to the extent that he was not always willing to regard the Greek as primary, nor allow the majority reading to decide. In the *14th Homily in Jeremiah* he could say, "But in the most correct copies, which agree with the Hebrew text, it stands" and give the citation.[8] After making an interpretation of a variant found "in most copies" he based his major comment upon the passage as "a further interpretation also . . . necessary, because the most accurate copies read thus."[9] While noticing that a certain reading was found "in most copies" for Canticles 8:5, he chose another reading against the majority.[10] He was not averse to appealing to Hebrew scholars for understanding on various matters connected with Jewish custom and exegesis.[11] In matters of proper names he recognized the superiority of the Hebrew text over the ecclesiastical copies. Here may be seen some awareness of value in readings as against the mere weight of numbers. Yet, he was very cautious about deleting corruptions from his text, due to his high regard for the tradition of the church. It should also be pointed out that Origen showed great tolerance in matters of textual judgment, oftentimes calling upon those who opposed his views to deduce a solution of their own, and even at times setting forth a fairly good case for an opposing view.[12]

Since the primary interest of this study is Origen's evaluation of variants in the New Testament text, we have noticed his work on the Old Testament as a background for this part of the study. For the New Testament he stated, "It is a recognized fact that there is much diversity in our copies."[13] Souter states the situation facing Origen in saying, "Clement's successor, Origen . . . had every then existing type of text at his disposal."[14] He not only noticed in many places in his writings the variants in copies he possessed, but he endeavored to classify the causes for these variants.[15] While his statements on causation may leave something to be desired for comprehensiveness, he noticed at least four major causes. Three of these

---

[8]*14th Homily in Jeremiah,* translated by Tollinton, *Selections,* p. 169.

[9]*Loc. cit.*

[10]*Homilies in the Canticle of Canticles,* 1:6, Lommatzch, Vol. XIV: p. 249.

[11]*Selecta in Psalmos,* Lommatzsch, Vol. XI: p. 352. *Commentary on Matthew,* Bk. XI:9.

[12]*Commentary on Matthew,* Bk. XV:14.

[13]*Loc. cit.*

[14]Souter, Alexander, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), p. 82.

[15]Concerning fourteen passages in the Gospels Origen noticed variant readings in his writings. Some of these he discusses at length in his comments, and others he simply passes with only the notice of the variants. *Vide* Frank Pack, *The Methodology of Origen as a Textual Critic in Arriving at the Text of the New Testament* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1948), pp. 128-141.

are taken into account in the famous passage already partially cited from the *Commentary on Matthew*, Bk. XV.

> But it is a recognized fact that there is much diversity in our copies, whether by the carelessness of certain scribes, or by some culpable rashness in the corrections of the text, or by some people making arbitrary additions or omissions in their corrections.[16]

(1) Variation existed due to carelessness in scribal transmission, and it is very likely that the extent of this variation was far greater than appears to us today, since the period before Origen was one of careless manuscript transmission. As Streeter has pointed out, the church was poor and persecuted in many places, and its copies made by poor scribes.[17] Even in exemplars used by Origen himself some of these errors evidently existed. This type of variation would be called by modern handbooks on textual criticism "unintentional variation."

Origen was also aware of intentional corrections made on the copies of the church. (2) He listed the second cause of variation as "culpable rashness in the correctness of the text." He noticed under different circumstances the "violent means" of the heretics in abusing the text, and evidently he was not including that type of correction in this category.[18] Many within "orthodox" church circles were apparently correcting their copies according to various dogmatic ideas, some appearing very bold and even perverse in the eyes of Origen, the textual scholar. For instance, he noticed that some would have deleted the entire story of the Rich Man and Lazarus on the dogmatic ground that it was hardly reasonable to think of Abraham's bosom as being large enough to receive all the faithful at death.[19] Others seemed puzzled by the problem of reconciling the passage telling that Jesus would spend three days and nights in the heart of the earth with the promise made to the thief on the cross.

> For how is any one to spend three days and three nights in the heart of the earth who, immediately on his departure, was to be in the Paradise of God, according to the words, Today shalt thou be with me in the Paradise of God? The passage so distresses some people by its discrepancy that they make bold to suppose that the words, Today shalt thou be with me in the Paradise of God, were an addition to the Gospel made by some unscrupulous hand.[20]

Here one gets an insight into the kinds of alterations taking place on the text of the New Testament. Against this bolder form of cor-

---

[16]*Commentary on Matthew*, Bk. XV:14.

[17]Streeter, Burton Hillman, *The Four Gospels* (London: MacMillan and Company, 1927), p. 36.

[18]Note his condemnations of Marcionites, Valentinians, Lucianites for their additions (*Contra Celsum*, Bk. II:27) and his condemnation of the interpretative additions of Heracleon (*Commentary on John*, Bk. II:8).

[19]*Commentary on John*, Bk. XXXII:13.

[20]*Commentary on John*, Bk. XXXII:19. Translated by Tollinton, *Selections*, p. 221.

rection, Origen was certainly opposed, finding for himself the solutions of such problems in his interpretation.

(3) A third cause of variation was the additions and subtractions arbitrarily made by various scribes without adequate reasons in Origen's judgment. He called these "arbitrary" because they were made without any standards or controls, which seemed so necessary to the textual scholar, for immediately after this statement he cited the method he used in correcting the diversity in the Old Testament, mentioning the controls he used for such correction.

(4) A fourth cause for diversity Origen found in the corruptions of the heretics. Celsus had in rather strong terms accused the Christian believers of corrupting their Gospels to enable them to answer the objections brought against their religion. In a highly apologetic passage Origen placed the entire blame on the heretics for the corruptions by saying,

> Now I know of no others who have altered the Gospel, save, the followers of Marcion, and those of Valentinus, and, I think, also those of Lucian. But such an allegation is no charge against the Christian system, but against those who dared so to trifle with the Gospels.[21]

However, it is clear as has been previously pointed out, that he did recognize other causes of corruption in the texts. That the heretics did make "violent and arbitrary" changes is certainly true, but that this same procedure is confined entirely to them is not true. Yet, one notices in Origen a "stiffening" attitude against such changes, both intentional and unintentional.

In giving notices of variation in the copies he knew, at times Origen expressed his judgment, and thus he gives some indications of his evaluation of readings. In these notices of variants five categories of correction or preference may be discerned. (1) Corrections based on dogmatic reasons. In Matthew 27:16 his copy read *Iesoun ton Barabban* (Jesus Barabbas) instead of *Barabban* (Barabbas). He felt that this addition was made by the heretics, since the name of Jesus could not be joined to such a person of ill-repute as Barabbas.[22] In Luke 23:44, 45 Origen found some copies reading "the sun being eclipsed" (*tou he liou ekleipontos*) in the place of "the sun was darkened" (*kai eskotisthe*). Confronted with the fact that no eclipse had been recorded for the time of Jesus' death (a historical influence on his judgment), he attributed the copies reading "the sun being eclipsed" either to the desire on someone's part to make the statement concerning the sun's darkness more clear, or, more probably he

---

[21]*Contra Celsum*, Bk. II:27.

[22]*Matthaeum Commentariorum Series*, 121, Lommatzsch, Vol. V, p. 35. "In multis exemplaribus non continetur, quod Barabbas etiam Jesus dicebatur, et forsitan recte, ut ne nomen Jesu conveniat alicui iniquorum." Translated, "In many copies it is not contained that Barabbas was also called Jesus, and perhaps correctly, so that the name of Jesus might not be joined with those of sinners." (translation mine)

thought to the changes made by the heretics, since the Gospels would not have made such an error of this kind.[23] Both Matthew and Mark had his preferred reading in the parallel passages. That enabled an explanation that could be satisfactory to reason and history as well as dogma. The extent of this type of "correction" is difficult to ascertain in Origen, but at least it may be said to have been at work as these cases testify. (2) He also suggested corrections based on geography. In John 1:28 he found the reading "These things were done in Bethany." He says, "We are convinced, however, that we should not read 'Bethany,' but 'Bethabara.' We have visited the places to enquire as to the footsteps of Jesus and His disciples and of the prophets."[24] To substantiate his argument, he pointed out that Bethany did not exist in the locality referred to in this passage. To further substantiate his position, he cited the many inaccuracies in names and places in the Greek copies of the Old and New Testaments. To him Bethabara fulfilled the geographic requirements and whether he found the reading in any copy or not (and of this we cannot be sure) this was the reading he proposed.[25] In the same connction he cited the three readings for Matthew 8:28 on "Gergesa," "Gerasa," and "Gadara." It cannot be definitely shown whether he found all of the readings in copies of Matthew or not, although the implications would point in that direction. He pointed out that the "Gergesenes" referred to an old town located near the Lake of Tiberias, whereas "Gerasenes" would refer to a town in Arabia, and "Gadarenes" would refer to a town in Judea. The first reading was preferred by him. He stated that the Evangelists, so well acquainted with the geography of the country, would not have made such an error, and he attributed the error to the copyists.[26] Here we also see a dogmatic reason being used with the geographic reason in his evaluations.

(3) Corrections made on harmonistic reasons appear in the judgments expressed. In Matthew 19:19 Origen rejected the reading "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" as a spurious addition. He thought it was probable that these errors were added by someone who did not "grasp the exact significance of the passage."[27] He rejected the reading on two bases: first, because the context does not bear out the meaning into which this passage might fit; and, second, because neither Mark nor Luke contains the additional words. For, he argued, "Had the words, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself been also spoken in addition to the other commandments,

---

[23]*Matthaeum Commentariorum Series*, 134, Translated by Tollinton, *Selections*, p. 118. Former reading supported Aleph B C L Sah Bah Syn hkl. mg. Latter reading supported A D Q R X Gamma, Theta, fam. 1 Syr C. S. Pesh pales. Aeth. Old Lat. Vg.

[24]*Commentary on John*, Bk. VI:24.

[25]Note Chrysostom's note about it being in the best copies.

[26]*Loc. cit.*

[27]*Commentary on Matthew*, Bk. XV:13. Translated by Tollinton, *Selections*, p. 108.

Mark and Luke would not have omitted this comprehensive and most excellent commandment."[28] He could not see why Jesus would have said, "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell whatever thou hast, and give to the poor," if the man had fulfilled the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Contextual meaning and harmony with the other Synoptics become his measures of control in this passage.

In Mark 6:3 he preferred the reading "the son of the carpenter" (*he Tou Tektovos huios*) rather than "the carpenter" (*ho tekton*). In answering Celsus, Origen declared, "In none of the Gospels current in the churches is Jesus Himself ever described as being a carpenter."[29] Hautsch is inclined to think this is a mistake of Origen's memory, but it seems much more plausible that Origen actually preferred the readings in those copies with which he was acquainted in the churches, and which agreed with the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke. It is hard to rule out dogmatic considerations in such an instance. As has been previously noted one of his reasons for preferring the reading in Luke 23:44, 45 "the sun was darkened" is that it is in harmony with the accounts of Matthew and Mark. "We say then that Matthew and Mark have not stated that an eclipse occurred at that time."[30]

(4) Corrections based on the majority of the copies. In the above-mentioned reading for Luke 23:44, 45 his preferred reading is also the reading he found in "very many copies." In the above-mentioned reading for Mark 6:3, the consensus of the copies used in the churches is also a determining factor. The tradition of the church was a very strong element in his thinking.

(5) Corrections were also based on the etymology of words, which seemed to have a special interest to Origen on account of the mystical values. Possibly upon etymology alone he would not have made corrections in the text, but since it offered additional help in places, he used it. In the case of "Bethabara" the etymology of the word indicated the meaning of "house of preparation" and consequently seemed more suitable to the work of John the Baptist, according to Origen, than Bethany meaning "house of obedience."

Origen did not work out so detailed a methodology for the New Testament text as for the Old Testament, probably because he lacked adequate controls which would have enabled him to make corrections in the copies used by the churches. It should be kept constantly in mind that his tremendous regard for the tradition of the church made him want to preserve all of value in that tradition and made him shrink from much correction. A careful study of Origen's mul-

---

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 109

[29] *Contra Celsum*, Bk. VI:36, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IV, p. 589. This reading given by P^{45} fam. 13 33 472 565 579 700 a b c r i r^2 Vg. Boh. Aeth.

[30] *Matthaeum Commentariorum Series*, 134. Translated by Tollinton, *Selections*, p. 118.

tiple variants in the Gospels shows how wide Origen's knowledge of various textual traditions extended. It has also shown his own use of the text with the practical uses of preaching and teaching in mind as a part of the process of "correction" resulting in earlier ecclesiastical texts. Apparently he made notes on the margins of his copies, which were highly regarded as late as the time of Jerome.[31] He was powerfully influenced by the Alexandrian regard for ancient copies, as well as the number of copies exhibiting a reading.

It would seem that his main controls in the New Testament were contextual meaning and internal probability, harmonistic controls, and the tradition of the church. For instance, in rebuttal against the interpretative additions made by Heracleon to the text of John 1:3 he says,

> And as his statements on the passage are obviously very much forced and in the face of the evidence . . . we need not waste our time in rebutting what is, on the face of it, absurd, when without warrant from Scripture, he adds to the words, "Without Him was nothing made" the further words, "Of what is in the earth and the creation." In this proposal, which has no inner probability to recommend it, he is asking us, in fact to trust him . . ."[32]

Here he appeals to internal probability in a reading as well as the manuscript evidence.

In summary, Origen, as a textual scholar was aware of the extent of variation in copies of the New Testament books; he classified the causes of variation; he listed to some extent variant readings for passages, taking into account different textual traditions known to him; he devised simple controls for judging readings, regardless of how inadequate they may have seemed to later textual scholars; and he engaged in cautious corrections of his copies.

---

[31]Jerome, *In Matt.* XXIV:36; *In Gal.* III:1.
[32]*Com. on John,* Bk. II:15. Ante-Nicene Fathers.

A Note

Martin Luther on Infant Baptism

In response to the article by Thomas N. Schulz in our last number on the relation of baptism to justification by faith in the teaching of Martin Luther[1] Harry W. Dahlstrom calls attention to a quotation by Luther on the question of infant baptism. Inasmuch as this quotation reveals at least one of the positions Luther took on the subject and since we hope the *Quarterly* will serve as a source for reference, the quotation is given below. It is Luther's "Collection of Sermons on the Church," in the sermon for the third Sunday following Epiphany on Matt. 8:1 (? 18:1ff):

> The sophists in universities and of the Papal gang have fabricated the story that young children are baptized without personal faith, namely on the faith of the Church, which the sponsors confess at the baptism; whereupon in and by virtue of the baptism, the little child receives forgiveness of sins and personal faith is poured in with grace, so that through the water and Holy Spirit it becomes a new-born child. But if one asks them as to the ground of such answer, and where it stands in Scripture, then one finds them in a dark smoke-hole; or they point to their biretta (R.C. clerical cap) and say, "We are the most learned Doctors, and say it is so; therefore it is right, and you are not permitted to inquire further," as if all their learning had no other ground than their own dreams and conceit. From these lies they have traveled further, and are come so far that they have taught and hold this also, that the sacraments have such strength that, though thou hast no personal faith and profanest the sacrament, thou dost still obtain grace and the forgiveness of sins without any faith.
>
> The sophists go further, and explain thus the words of the holy Fathers, that the children, though baptized without personal faith and by the faith of the Church alone, obtain grace—for they (the sophists) are the enemies of faith—where they would wish to exalt only works faith must suffer; and they never once think whether the holy Fathers err or whether they themselves rightly understand the Fathers. From this poison and error guard thyself, even though it were the expressed opinion of all the Fathers and Councils alike. For it does not exist, has no foundation for itself in the Scripture, but in vain human conceit and dreams. In addition, it is directly contrary to the foregoing chief scripture, where Christ says: "Who believes and is baptized, the same shall be saved," and so forth. The brief conclusion is: "Baptism helps no one, is also to be given to no one, except he believes for himself, and without personal faith no one is to be baptized." As also St. Augustine himself says: "Non sacramentum justifica, sed fides sacramenti" (The sacrament does not justify, but the faith of the sacrament).
>
> In addition to these there are some others, as those called Waldensian Brethren, who hold that each must believe for himself and must by his own faith receive baptism or the sacra-

[1]See *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1960), pp. 94-103, especially page 102.

[2]See the reference quoted in *Baptism* by Johannes Warns (Paternoster Press, 19), p. 141.

ment, otherwise to him baptism or the sacrament profits nothing. So far they speak and hold aright. But that they go further, and baptize nevertheless the young children, whom they also hold to be such as have no faith of their own; this is a mockery of holy baptism; and they sin against that other commandment in that they take needlessly and in vain God's name and word, with knowledge and wantonly. It avails them also nothing to use the subterfuge that they baptize children on their future faith when they come to intelligence, for faith must be present before or at the baptism, else the child is not delivered from the devil or from sin.

Therefore, if their opinion were right, all that is done with the child in baptism must be empty lies. For at it the baptizer asks if the child believes and someone answers in its stead "Yes." Yet no one is baptized in its stead, but the child itself is baptized. Therefore must itself also believe, or the godparents lie when they say in its stead, I believe. Where we are not able to prove that the young children themselves believe and have personal faith, it is my sincere counsel and judgment that one straightway desist, and the sooner the better, and never more baptize any child, as that we no more mock and blaspheme the most blessed majesty of God with such baseless tomfoolery and jugglery.

Contrary-to-Fact Conditions

J. W. Roberts

One of the most definite and easily recognized constructions in the New Testament is the Contrary-To-Fact Conditional Sentence.[1] When clearly comprehended it becomes a great help in exegesis. By understanding the nature and meaning of the usage and marking the instances of its occurrence in the New Testament, the student and teacher, even if he is a beginner in the study of the original language, will be prepared to make use of its significance in building sermons and explaining the meaning of passages of Scripture.

The form and meaning of this type of sentence are quite simple. It is of the variety "If this man had not lied, he would not have been punished." The sentence assumes that the condition in the if clause (the protasis) was not true—the man did lie, and it also assumes that the conclusion is also unreal—the man was in fact punished. The sentence simply states what "would have happened" had the condition not been (as it was) realized.

A typical example of this type of sentence in the New Testament is the statement of Paul in 1 Corinthians 2:8: "If they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." Here Paul reasons that an example of the way God's mystery in other ages was hid from the world is to be seen in the crucifixion of Jesus. The rulers did crucify Jesus; but, if the full implication of the revelation of the Gospel had been made to them and had been understood by them, they would never have crucified the Saviour.

There are some fifty-one examples of this type of sentence in the New Testament. This means that the construction is not as frequent as some of the other types of conditional sentences (the real or first class has 329 and the anticipatory or third class has 322). Still it is an important construction. A construction which touches fifty statements in the New Covenant cannot but be of interest to the student of that book.

The construction in the original is of such nature that usually its recognition is without doubt. The sentence is introduced by the particle *ei* ("if") and must have a secondary or past tense of the indicative mood (imperfect, aorist, or pluperfect) as a verb. The conclusion must also have a past-tense verb and usually has the particle *an* as a sign of the unreal character of the conclusion.

The time of the condition is determined by the tense of the verb. Usually the aorist or pluperfect places the action of the sentence in the past. In 1 Corinthians 2:8 quoted above the verb is aorist, and the action of "crucified" is past from the point of view of the writer.

---

[1]There is a fine summary of this condition in B. F. Westcott's *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Macmillan Co., 1906), pp. 111-114.

Here the aorist signifies the completed act in past time; but, where the pluperfect tense is used, the sense is continuous action. 1 John 2:19 illustrates this: "If they had been of us, they would have remained with us" (continually remained, that is).

The imperfect tense in the verb of either clause usually places the action of the condition in the present, or at the time of speaking or writing. In Luke 7:39 the Pharisee said of Jesus, "If he were a prophet (which he had assumed Jesus not to be), then would he know who and what sort of woman it is who touches him." Here the statement is present, not past; Jesus is assumed not to *be* a prophet, not "if he had been (in the past) a prophet."

There are some instances in the New Testament, as in the earlier stages of the language, where the particle *an* is omitted, leaving the context as the criterion by which this condition must be distinguished from the past examples of the first or real condition. Usually there is no trouble. Note Paul's saying of the members of the body, "If the whole were one member, where would the body *be*?" It is quite clear, that he means that it is absurd to think of the body as composed of only one member.

The construction is relatively more common in the Gospel of John than any other book of the New Testament, eighteen of the examples being in that book.

There are many interesting and important truths of revelation which are stated in the Scriptures by this construction. Sermons can be built around some of these:

1. Jesus is a revelation of God the Father, John 14:7.
2. Jesus is a faithful revealer of God's truth; he will not deceive us concerning heavenly things, John 14:2.
3. Sin could not be made to be known as sin except by a revelation (the law) from God, Romans 7:7.
4. The law of Moses still could not justify man from sin, Gal. 3:21.
5. Perfection could never come under the priesthood of the law, Hebrews 7:11.
6. Jesus can give us "living water" with which "we shall never thirst," John 4:10; just as Mary confidently believed that Jesus had power over physical death and life, John 11:21, 32.
7. Jesus' kingdom is not a material or temporal kingdom, and it is not extended or defended by the sword, Mark 13:20.
8. The church or body of Christ is made up of many individuals who constitute the members of his body, 1 Corinthians 12:19.
9. We cannot please God if our preaching changes the gospel revealed by Paul to please men, Galatians 1:10.

One word of caution needs to be taken into consideration. The use of modal ideas in language involves the *statement* of the predication with respect to reality and not reality itself. We can have confidence in the truthfulness of all the above uses of the contrary-to-fact condition because of the person who uttered the statement and because the context of each case indicates that the statement is sincerely uttered. In Luke 7:39 the Pharisee assumes that Jesus did not know who the woman was who touched him and reasons that Jesus there-

fore was not a prophet. In this respect his negative assumption was wrong and his premise does not constitute a truth.

The complete list of New Testament examples of the contrary-to-fact conditions is as follows:

Matthew 11:21, 23; 23:30; 24:22, 43; 26:24; without a protasis, 25:27; Mark 13:20; 14:21; Luke 7:39; 10:13; 12:39; mixed, Luke 17:6; aposiopesis, Luke 19:42; without protasis, Luke 19:23; John 4:10; 5:46; 8:18 *bis*, 42; 9:33, 41; 11:21, 32; 14:2, 7, 28; 15:19, 22, 24; 18:30, 36; 19:11; Acts 18:14; 26:32; Rom. 7:7 *bis*; 9:29 (LXX); 1 Corinthians 2:8; 11:31; 12:19; Galatians 1:10; 3:21; 4:7; Hebrews 4:8; 8:4, 7; 7:11; 11:15; 1 John 2:19.

The Herald of Gospel Liberty and the Life, Conversion, Preaching, and Suffering of Elias Smith Now on Film

Through the courtesy of Robert W. Lawrence of Worcester, Mass., the library of Abilene Christian College has recently secured microfilm copies of the religious newspaper published by Elias Smith, one of the early preachers of the "Christian Connection" movement. This movement is one of the important ones that made contribution to the effort to restore the New Testament church. Also secured was a microfilm copy of Smith's life. The newspaper was published in New England between the years 1807 and 1817. The works were located in the Worcester Antiquarian Society by Bro. Lawrence and filmed through the cooperation of that institution. The expense of the project was borne by some friends of the college in Abilene.

This find is a continuing part of the work of the library at ACC to collect and make available source materials for the Restoration Movement. Those who might be interested in securing duplicates of this material may correspond with the librarian at Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, for details.

OTHER NEW SOURCE MATERIALS OF INTEREST

The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky., has recently published an autobiographical manuscript written by J. W. McGarvey, the great teacher and preacher who put his major life's work into the building of that school. The title of the booklet (93 pages) is *The Autobiograghy of J. W. McGarvey* (1829-1911). The booklet was prepared by McGarvey in the years 1905-06 for his son who was to prepare a biography. The son, however, preceded the father in death, and the book was never written. This copy, published just as it was written by McGarvey, is thus not really a connected and polished work, but sketches, memories, facts, etc., set down by its writer. McGarvey did, however, follow a chronological sequence so that the material makes interesting reading. It is certainly a prize discovery.

McGarvey, probably more than any other one person, foresaw what inroads into the Restoration Movement the twin influences of digression and rationalisim would make. He gave himself to the task of developing a sound hermeneutics on the one hand would would continue to make a sane application of the principle of New eTstament authority and to analyzing the errors and presuppositions of liberalism which would destroy what he believed respecting the authority of the Bible.

We understand that David Bobo of Indianapolis, Indiana, is working on a thesis on the life of Bro. McGarvey. We hope that when it is complete it may be published in book form.

SOME MATERIAL ON RICE HAGGARD

This writer has recently reworked some of the early materials on Rice Haggard, an early preacher who was associated with James O'-Kelly in North Carolina and later with Barton W. Stone in Kentucky. Some new material is available on this early period of the Restoration Movement which may not have come to the attention of our readers. First, the Disciples Historical Society (Nashville, Tennessee) published a manuscript found in 1953 of a pamphlet published by Haggard at Lexington, Ky., in 1804 in which Haggard contended for the name Christian as the name by which God's people should be known and put forward a plan of unity on the basis of a "Christian-only" plea." Dr. Colby D. Hall of TCU has written a story of Haggard's life entitled *Rice Haggard, the American Frontier Evangelist Who Revived the Name Christian* (Fort Worth, T. C. U. Press, 1957, 75 pp). This book makes use of the new material on Haggard. Dr. Hall has also recently written a history of the "Christian Churches," the loose association of churches which are commonly referred to in the literature of the movement as "the Christian Connection." This book is also announced by the T. C. U. Press.

Kenneth Greene, *The Life and Times of James A. Harding*, unpublished thesis, summer 1960, Library Abilene Christian College. This thesis is the first known work examining in any detail the life and work of this great preacher and educator among the churches of Christ. Harding was co-founder witih David Lipscomb of the college which bears the latter's name. He was also the founder and president of a college at Bowling Green, Kentucky, known as Potter College. It was from this school that the impulse for several other colleges in the west had its origin. There is a direct line of connection between it and Harding College of Searcy, Arkansas, which now bears his name. He was a long-time contributor to the *Gospel Advocate* and *The Christian Leader* and for several years published his own paper, *The Way*. He was especially great as an evangelist and debater. Many of the great men who have powerfully affected the churches of our day were indoctrinated and inspired at his feet. The keynote of his life was his great faith in God and in his providence. Those wishing to read this thesis might borrow it from the Library at ACC for reading.

Another student at ACC is now working on a thesis on the life of Tolbert Fanning. He has uncovered a wealth of information about the life of this early Tennessee preacher (See *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1). This work will also make a contribution to the literature of the churches of Christ.

SOME NOTES ON RECENT ARTICLES

Nigel M. Watson, "Some Observations on the Use of *dikaioo* in the Septuagint," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* LXXIX (1960), pp. 255-266. This article consists of an examination of the contentions of N. H. Snaith and M. J. Lagrange that the N. T. use of the verb

meaning "I justify" must be looked at against the background of its use in the Greek version of the O. T. and that in this usage the judicial or forensic sense of "acquit" or "declare righteous" and the second sense of "vindicate" were not as strong as in the Hebrew words which the Greek translators were rendering. Watson's conclusion is "that the LXX translators intended *dikaioo* to carry substantially the same range of meanings as that carried (by the Hebrew word), and that when they used the Greek verb, they did have the picture of a judge as clearly in their minds as did the authors of the Hebrew Bible when they used the Hebrew equivalent. Those who preach on the N. T. theme of justification need to pay special attention to the exact meaning of the original word.

K. P. C. A. Gramberg, "'Leprosy' and the Bible," *The Bible Translator* II (1960), pp. 10-22; pp. 80-21. The "leprosy" of the Old and New Testaments covers undeniably different ideas from the disease (Hanson's Disease) with which we associate the word today. The stigma falsely attached by the continued use of the term often hampers the treatment and causes untold agony to innocent people. The doctor and linguist ought to do all within their power to give these sufferers back their good name.

Paul L. Hammer, "A Comparison of *kleronomia* in Paul and Ephesians," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* (LXXIX, Sept., 1960), pp. 267-272. This article draws support for the deutero-Pauline authorship of Ephesians from a comparison of the uses of the word "inheritance" (along with the kindred words, "heir," "inherit," and "fellowheir") in Romans-Galatians and in Ephesians. The material pointed to is very interesting. It is shown that in the former books the promise of "inheritance" is a present reality in the work of Christ (Gal. 3:16, 18) while in Ephesians (1:14, 18) it is the future possession of which the Spirit is the present earnest. The term "heir" is used in Gal. 3:29; 4:17; and Rom. 4:14 of the one inheriting the blessing promised to Abraham. In Rom. 8:15ff the fellowheir is used of those brought into the present inheritance by Christ; in Eph. 3:14ff the emphasis is somewhat similar, but the concern is with the unity of the church, Jew and Gentile being brought into it as fellowheirs. The conclusion is that in Ephesians the whole usage is more ecclesiological and eschatological while in "Paul" it is more Christological and soteriological (having to do with salvation).

Hammer's facts are interesting, but he overplays their significance. His implication that Paul is not interested in the future eschatological concept of the Christian's life ("Paul never refers to 'the age which is to come'") he himself recognizes as erroneous, for he corrects it in a footnote reference to Romans 8:18ff. His assertion that Ephesians is not concerned with Christology is strange in the light of, for example, 1:10, 20-23; 4:0 ("one Lord"). Furthermore the entire point of the article is weakened by omitting from the data the parallel futuristic uses of the verb "inherit" in such passages as Eph.

5:5 and 1 Cor. 6:9,10 with the omission justified merely by calling them "largely traditional formulation."

Finally, the article ignores the obvious fact that such usage as this is metaphorical or analogous usage of language. It is not a mark of separate authorship that the same term may be used for comparative purposes in different passages from different viewpoints. Paul once employs the figure of the marriage relationship to say that we are married to Christ to bring forth fruit to him (Romans 7:1ff), but in another place we are merely betrothed to him (1 Cor. 11:2).

Abe Malherbe, "Hospitality and the Early Church," *North Atlantic Christian* II, No. 8 (1960), 104-5. The hospitality of the early Christians fitted closely into the development of missionary enterprise and the close sense of brotherhood and cooperation of the early church. Urged upon the church by its inspired teachers who insisted that it be practiced ungrudgingly, it took the form of a distinct social characteristic which led others to take note of Christians as neither Jew nor pagan but "a third force." A return to a practice today would tend to nullify tendencies toward isolation and disunity, and effectively promote fellowship and the growth of the church.

Pat Harrell, "The Missing Motto," in the *North Atlantic Christian* II, No. 7 (1960), p. 87. A short analysis of the prayer "maranatha" (1 Corinthians 16:22) meaning "Our Lord come." Note is taken that the attitude of "desiring the coming of the Lord" and praying for it soon ceased in the early church. "In all probability the disappearance was caused not by a change of doctrine, but by a change in desire. The church could not pray the type of prayer that Augustine uttered while enjoying a sinful life, 'O Lord, make me good, but not now.' That is, when the church realized that it was not ready for the parousia, it ceased to petition for it." "For the church to make progress it must keep one foot on the ground and one in the air—it must work and wait. Only then can it pray, as did the early church, 'maranatha'."

Kendrick Grobel, "*Soma* as 'Self, Person' in the Septuagint," in *Neutestamentliche Studien Fuer Adolph Bultmann* (Berlin, Toepelmann, 1957), pp. 52-59. This is an interesting article in which the Pauline passages (for example, Phil. 1:20; Rom. 6:12f; 12:1; 1 Cor. 6:15) which use the Greek word "body" in the sense of Self or Parson are shown to correspond to a frequent use of the same word in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Those wishing to pursue the thought further may compare these passages with such O. T. references where the word *soma* also occurs as Daniel 3:27 (28); Gen. 36:6; 47:12,18; Neh. 9:37; 1 Kings 14:9; Prov. 25:20; 2 Mac. 8:11.

G. D. Kilpatrick, "Gal. 2:14, *orthopodousia*." *Ibid*, pp. 269-274. After evaluating the known instances of the use of the word rendered "walk uprightly" in Gal. 2:14, where Paul recalls his rebuke of Peter for acting hypocritically, and after examining the renderings of the verb in the early versions, the writer concludes that "not going

straight toward the truth of the Gospel" is the most likely meaning of Paul's phrase. He concludes that whatever rendering we give it "the passage suggests that the truth of the Gospel is not something necessarily gained at the moment of becoming a Christian, but something which may be acquired only in time. This may not imply a progressive revelation, but a revelation progressively comprehended."

Sherwood Eliot Wirt, "The World Mission Situation," in *Christianity Today* IV, No. 22 (August 1, 1960), pp. 894ff. This is one of the principal articles in a special issue of this conservative fortnightly magazine. The special is on the present status and outlook for world missions. The entire offering of the issue contains material which ought to interest every reader of the *Restoration Quarterly*. Even in the midst of world tension and emergence of new nations with independent outlooks, it is quite clear that opportunities for missionary enterprises based upon conviction and faith in God's Word are everywhere.

Since this writer spent part of this past summer in Latin America, the section of this article on that area entitled "Latin America: An Open Door" was of special interest. It is reported that there is an evangelical community in Latin America today of 6.5 million and that this population is growing rapidly. The Roman Catholic sources themselves were quoted to the effect that of the 95 per cent of the population which are claimed by that faith hardly more han 10 per cent really practice it. A century ago Brazil had one Protestant for every 250,000 Roman Catholics. Today there is one Protestant for every 39 Roman Catholics.

Bible Key Words. The most monumental work of the present generation in Bible studies is the *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum NT*, under the editorship of Gerhard Kittel. The first volume appeared in 1933, and the volumes continue to appear. It is a theological dictionary of broad scope. It is of much greater detail but of the same order as the work of Kramer, of Vincent's *Word Studies*, and Robertson's *Word Pictures* or the more recent theological word book of Richardson, some of which will be familiar to the reader. The results of this vast labor are gradually making their way into English. Under the title *Bible Key Words*, Vol. 1 (1951) and Vol. 2 (1958) Harpers is publishing translations of selected articles. Already appeared are the articles on "Love," "Church," "Sin," and "Righteousness" (all in Vol. 1) and "Apostleship," "Gnosis" (knowledge), "Basileia" (Sovereignty, kingdom), and "Lord." Another article "The Servant of God" was published in *Studies in Biblical Theology* in 1957.

As is indicated by the fact that one good-sized volume in English is made up of only four articles, these treatments are quite long and comprehensive. It should be noted, however, that usually all words, including verbs, nouns, adjectives, as well as compounds, are treated together under one single subject. This makes each article actually a composite one.

It is to be hoped that the English translation of these articles will continue and that eventually the entire set will be made available in something like its German form. Readers of the *Quarterly* who have not previously known of this group of works may want to investigate them with a view to adding these books to their library.

THE NEXT ISSUE A SPECIAL ON ACTS

The next issue of the *Quarterly* which will be ready shortly after the first of the year will be a special issue on Acts of Apostles. The last special dealing with the books of 1 and 2 Corinthians was so well received that it has been decided to make this number of the same type.

This will be the fourth of the double-size numbers which we have printed in which all articles deal with a common theme. These have been on Baptism, the Church, the Corinthian correspondence, and now Acts of Apostles. We have frequently been told that these numbers within themselves have justified our efforts in the *Quarterly*

Book Reviews

EDITOR, PAT HARRELL

OLD TESTAMENT

A History of Israel. By JOHN BRIGHT. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 500 pp. Maps. $7.50.

Recent years have witnessed the emergence of a significant and distinctively American approach to Old Testament Studies which has centered in the work of William F. Albright. One of the outstanding representatives of this approach is John Bright, the Cyrus H. McCormick Professor of Hebrew and Interpretation of the Old Testament at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond. Already known from his earlier publications, *The Kingdom of God* and *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, Professor Bright has achieved added stature with the publication of *A History of Israel.*

This publication brings into focus the changing mood in Old Testament Studies in the present generation. Archæological advances have shown the older reconstructions of the history of Israel in the Welhausen tradition to be no longer tenable. The Welhausen tradition has been replaced by new approaches to the interpretation of the history of Israel. These attempts are the result of the combined influences of form criticism and the study of archæology and the history of religion. The most important of these new approaches are represented by the German form critics, Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth, and the more conservative and archæologically centered "Albright School."

The distinctive feature of the work of Professor Bright, in contrast to the older histories of Israel, is the value which he places on the Biblical record. Although he applies the methods of form criticism, the results are surprisingly conservative. For example, in discussing the patriarchal narratives he states that the "essential historicity of the traditions cannot be impeached," although "detailed reconstructions are impossible" (p. 68). This conservative conclusion is the result of the careful attention which is given to the age to which the records refer and the evaluation of these records in terms of the available data.

The fruits of this methodology are most readily seen in the treatment given the earlier periods of the history, or "pre-history," of Israel. The patriarchal narratives, for example, are illuminated by the archæological evidence which bears on the life and customs of the period to which the patriarchs belonged. The evidence is such that not only is Professor Bright able to say that the patriarchs are historical figures, but he is able to fit them into a historical con-

text. They are seen to be "a part of that migration of seminomadic clans which brought a new population to Palestine in the early centuries of the second millennium B.C." (p. 86). Although the events of the Exodus and Sinai are of such a nature that they cannot be documented externally, Professor Bright contends that the uniqueness of Israel's faith requires a founder as surely as does Christianity, and that to deny that role to Moses necessitates the positing of another person of the same name!

In order to gain a clear perspective of the distinctiveness of the position of Professor Bright one may contrast his treatment of the Conquest of Canaan with that of the older literary critics and the form critics of the school of Alt and Noth. The literary critical school of Welhausen stressed the differences in the picture of the conquest found in Judges 1 and the picture given in Joshua 1-12. They held that Judges 1 is "J" material and therefore the oldest and most reliable account. Therefore they rejected a united conquest under Joshua. They reconstructed a two-phase conquest—one under the Judah tribe and the other under the Joseph tribes. The account is later idealized in the picture of a conquest under Joshua. (The elaboration of this position is found in George Foot Moore's commentary on Judges.) For Noth there is really no "conquest" at all. Rather, as seminomads they wandered into the land in the process of changing pastures and began to settle permanently in the sparsely settled areas peacefully and without the use of force. This was a complicated process which extended over a considerable length of time and passed through several stages. As Noth says in his recent *The History of Israel*, "the tribes only became consolidated into permanent historical realities in the process of their occupation of the land" (p. 53). It is this consolidation of the tribes within Palestine that Noth considers the beginning of the history of Israel. (Not with the Patriarchs as for Bright nor with Moses and the Exodus as for Wellhausen.) The traditions of the conquest are aetiological traditions which proceeded from a time in which the tribes are already living in the land side by side and have accumulated some common historical experience. The narratives of Joshua 1-12 did not deal with Israel as a whole but dealt exclusively with the tribe of Benjamin. It is this tradition which has been preserved as a "basis for the concrete version of the joint Israelite occupation of the land west of Jordan" (p. 74).

Professor Bright, in contrast, stresses the archæological evidence which indicates that a number of the places in Southern Palestine which were said to have been taken by the Israelites (Debir, Lachish, Eglon, and Hazor in Northern Palestine) are known to have been violently destroyed in the latter part of the thirteenth century. On this basis he affirms that the account of Joshua 1-12 must be regarded as an authentic reflection of historical events. There are two

pictures which he feels must not be artificially harmonized, but neither is one or the other to be ruled out. Thus he concludes, "However complicated the Israelite occupation of Palestine may have been, and however schematized the narrative of Joshua, it may be regarded as certain that a violent irruption into the land took place late in the thirteenth century!" (p. 120).

Another important feature of this attempted reconstruction of the history of Israel is the serious attention given to the religious aspect of Israel's history and the recognition that the history of Israel is in fact inseparable from the history of Israel's religion. Professor Bright is abreast of the most recent work that has been done with respect to the history of Israel and her religion. He incorporates the work of G. E. Mendenhall, who interprets the covenant at Sinai in terms of the Hittite Suzerainty Treaty, into a meaningful exposition of the significance of the Covenant in Israel's history. The period of the Judges is treated in terms of the idea of Charismatic leadership.

While it may be gratifying to one who holds a conservative viewpoint toward the understanding of the Bible to find such confirmation of the historical authenticity of so much that has been so long challenged at the hands of literary criticism he must be willing to accept the challenge which is created by this treatment. While the essential authenticity of the record has been confirmed by Professor Bright's treatment many problems of detail, for example the 13th century date of the Exodus and Conquest or the treatment of the religious institutions of early Israel, have been brought into sharper focus.

Regardless of the attitude one may have concerning the application of form criticism to the Biblical materials and the disposals of various problems that are given, the reader will be immeasurably enriched by the insight into the history of the Israelites in the world in which they lived and moved, a world which was alive with movement and development of its own.

While this book has been prepared with the undergraduate theological student particularly in mind, the copious notes and bibliographical references make this work an important tool for the more advanced student as well.

Harold O. Forshey
Brookline, Mass.

NEW TESTAMENT

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? By Oscar Cullmann. London: The Epworth Press (distributed by MacMillan in America), 1958. 60pp. $1.25.

The material in this provocative little book was presented as the Ingersoll Lecture on the Immortality of Man for the academic year 1954-55 at Harvard U. For such a slender volume it has created quite a stir in theological circles. "No other publication of mine," states Professor Cullmann, "has provoked such enthusiasm or such violent hostil-

ity" (p. 5). Claiming to give "the witness of the New Testament" on this important subject, Cullmann states significantly that although his thesis has been challenged by "considerations of a philosophical, psychological, and above all sentimental kind," no critic has attempted to refute him by exegesis (p. 6).

The opening words of the Introduction focus the issue very swiftly. "If we were to ask an ordinary Christian today . . . what he conceived to be the New Testament teaching concerning the fate of man after death, with few exceptions we should get the answer: 'The immortality of the soul.' Yet this widely-accepted idea is one of the greatest misunderstandings of Christianity" (p. 15). Cullmann does not deny that there is an immortality of the soul. He is concerned rather to point out that "for the first Christians the soul is not intrinsically immortal, but rather became so only through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and through faith in him" (p. 17). This would seem to agree with such scriptures at Matt. 10:28 and 2 Tim. 1:10.

But how are we to conceive of the death of the soul? To us it suggests extinction or annihilatiion, and indeed Cullmann twice uses the latter word (pp. 26, 31). But oftener he speaks of it in terms of separation. Thus he says, "to die means to be utterly forsaken" (p. 23); it is to suffer "abandonment" and "separation from God" (p. 25). This would harmonize with the NT The death of the soul is not extinction, but endless existence apart from God, who is the source of all good, with all that that separation implies of suffering and horror (cf. 2 Thess. 1:8, 9).

Because this is what death meant to the early Christians, Cullmann points out that they spoke of it as "the last enemy" of God (1 Cor. 15:26) which would ultimately be cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:14). In direct contrast to the Christian view, the Greek philosophers thought of death as a friend. To them soul and body were opposed. Only the soul possessed true life and belonged to the eternal world. But it was imprisoned in the body and needed to be set free by death, "the soul's great friend" (p. 21). Cullmann points up this radical difference very effectively by contrasting the death of Socrates with that of Jesus. Socrates, with his optimistic view of death, dies a calm, serene, beautiful death. But Jesus, who knows the true meaning of death, dies a horrible death. All of the horror of separation from God comes to expression in that dreadful death-cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mark 15:34).

It is only against this dark background that we can see the glory of Christ's resurrection. As Cullmann says, "Only he who apprehends with the first Christians the horror of death . . . can comprehend the Easter exultation of the primitive Christian community . . ." (p. 26). Again he says, "Whoever paints a pretty death can paint no resurrection" (p. 27).

But how has death gained entrance to the world? Cullmann

answers by pointing to the Biblical connection between death and *sin* (Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12; 6:23; 1 Cor. 15:56). Death has come into the world only by the sin of man. "Death can be conquered only to the extent that sin is removed" (p. 28). Describing Christ's victory Cullmann says: "Sin and death must be conquered. We cannot do this. *Another* has done it for us; and He was able to do it only in that He betook himself to the province of death—that is, He himself died and expiated sin, so that death as the wages of sin is overcome. Christian faith proclaims that Jesus has done this and that He arose *with* body and soul after He was fully and really dead. Here God has consummated the miracle of the new creation expected at the End. Once again He has created life as in the beginning. At this point, in Jesus Christ, this has already happened!" (p. 38,f.).

This helps us to grasp the staggering significance of the resurrection. "For if there is really *one* spiritual body which has emerged from a fleshly body, then indeed the power of death is broken" (p. 40). "Death cannot put an end to the great fact that there is *one* risen body" (p. 41). What does this mean to the Christian? It means that although he must die, he will be raised from the dead! Because he is in Christ, and Christ has conquered death, death will not be able to hold him.

When will this resurrection take place? At death? No, says Cullmann, not until the End when Christ returns (p. 44). And with this the NT agrees. What is the condition of the dead in this interim state? With admirable restraint Cullmann admits that the NT does not speculate on the subject but says only that (1) it exists and that (2) it already signifies union with Christ (p. 51). Here too we can see that Jesus has robbed death of its horror, for death implies separation from God, but the dead in Christ are said to be with Christ. The intermediate state is, however, an imperfect state, inasmuch as it lacks the resurrection body (p. 54). At the Parousia this lack will be made up.

This little book by Professor Cullmann deserves wide reading and careful study by those of us who are interested in promulgating the NT faith. It can help us to see why the message of the early Christians centered in the resurrection of Christ (cf. Acts 2 and 1 Cor. 15). Above all it can help us to recapture some of the wonder and awe that this glorious faith should produce in us.

Brown Kinnard, Jr.
Holmes, Pa.

PHILOSOPHY

Speculation and Revelation in the Age of Christian Philosophy, by Richard Kroner. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959, 269 pp., $6.00.

This second volume of a trilogy on Speculation and Revelation in the History of Philosophy deals with the development of Christian philosophy and Christian theology between the second and the fifteenth centuries of the

Christian era. It studies the tensions between Reason and Revelation as each seeks to accommodate itself to the other. The treatment is pursued in complete sympathy and identification and in a style that is refreshing with its grace, clarity, simplicity and warmth. One is impressed with its profundity and at the same time its power to sustain a fascinated interest.

Doctor Kroner shows the interdependence of individuals and groups and systems. Earlier thinkers lay foundations, provide new insights and points of departure for those who follow and who build a variety of structures that embody former contributions and the individuality of the later speculative and theological architects. The author reveals the power to introduce the reader to the intimacy of the inner intellectual life of the great thinkers of the world so that one becomes aware of the feeling that he has actually been in conversation with the intellectual giants of western thought.

The two major terms "speculation" and "revelation" are not defined precisely, but an interesting description of each is given. Speculation is "that adventure of the human mind which aims at the solution of the supreme problem concerning the nature or essence of things. . . . In Christian philosophy it is directed toward the knowledge of God and therefore encounters that knowledge which revelation grants to the Christian believer." Revelation is "the specific form in which God makes known himself in and through Scripture, his purpose, his will, his love and wrath, his action and to a certain degree even the mystery of his own being."

This book is not a church history or a history of Christian dogma. It is a book about philosophical subjects, persons, and systems. It is concerned with the nature of things and their meaning. The point of view is that "the Christian approach, with its insistence on the supremacy of inspired subjective insight over unassisted human reason, supplied the huge deficiency that impaired all previous thinking and opened the way for modern philosophy." The reader will be grateful for this scholarly survey of pre-Christian thought by a Christian thinker, the contributions of Greek ideas for the coming of Christianity, the deficiency of speculation unaided by revelation, the provision made by Christian insights for real advances in philosophical thought, and how Christianity can carry on intelligent and profitable conversation with philosophy and science. This book will serve as a corrective for those who have not recognized the psychological and philosophical preparation which Greek thought provided for the coming of Christianity. It furnished the Christian mind with a number of concepts and categories without which Christian believers would have suffered from a lack of depth in their faith and thought.

Professor Kroner has a very delightful way of indicating the distinguishing mark of the great Christian philosophers. Clement of Alexandria was "the first great Christian philosopher."

Irenaeus was the first to begin a translation of the language of Scripture into that of conceptual, logical thought. He also marks the beginning of orthodoxy. Augustine was the founder of a Christian philosophy of time. "The unity between faith and knowledge is more welded in Augustine than in any previous thinker." He alone achieved perfect agreement between faith and thought, between revelation and speculation. Tertullian founded Christian theology in an anti-philosophic sense and was the first Christian thinker of high rank who was a Roman. Justin Martyr was the first writer to interpret the gospel from the point of view of the Logos concept. Origen was the last and the greatest among the Greek Christian philosophers. Dr. Kroner continues this practice throughout the book.

For the reader who loves philosophy and for the reader who is curious but uneasy about the paths down which philosophy leads, this book written by a Christian thinker at home in both revelation and speculation will be most welcome and helpful. For the Christian who wants more depth in his faith and a better understanding of Christian thought this book will be most rewarding.

Though the more exacting student may find fault with some of his terms as nebulous or even ambiguous, or the author's departure at points with Etienne Gilson whom he acclaims as the master philosopher, or his disagreement with John McIntyre on Anselm, the lover of wisdom will find many intellectual delights to feast upon in these pages. The first two volumes leave us most impatient to begin on the third.

Ralph V. Graham
300 White Horse Pike
West Collingswood 6, N. J.

Doctrinal

Thirty Years a Watch Tower Slave, by WILLIAM J. SCHNELL. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. $2.95.

Into the Light of Christianity, by WILLIAM J. SCHNELL. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. 211 pp. $2.95.

These two books from the pen of a former Jehovah's Witness leader have enjoyed a remarkable circulation. This fact is indicative of the widespread interest in the Witnesses. In the first work Schnell gives a biographical account of his activities in the Watch Tower organization, an insight into how it operates, and an account of how he escaped the brainwashing of a lifetime. The second volume is concerned with the fundamental doctrines of the movement that distinguish it from normative Christianity. These doctrines are set forth against the background of his experiences rather than a systematic theological appraisal. For an informative and fascinating account of the real Jehovah's Witnesses, these two books are basic.

The Bible on the Life Hereafter, by WILLIAM HENDRIKSEN. Grand Rapids: Baker Book

House, 1959. 222 pp. $3.95.

The distinguished commentator (*More Than Conquerors, New Testament Commentary*) attempts to give an exhaustive treatment of the Biblical doctrine of life after death. He covers fifty specific questions in as many chapters, following each by some questions of his own for class discussion. It is good to read a work of this nature whose author is neither a premillennialist nor a dispensationalist. Hendriksen's volume is recommended for general interest and for those who are disturbed by the teachings of the sects.

Book Notices

NEW TESTAMENT

Faith Is the Victory. By E. M. Blaiklock. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 64 pp. $2.00.

Professor Blaiklock, known for his *Commentary on Acts* in the Tyndale Series, presents his own translation and delightful commentary on First John. It is scholarly exact and devotionally rewarding. The author has a flair for illustrating and a style of writing that assure his work being read at one sitting.

Archaeology and the New Testament. By J. A. Thompson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 150 pp. $1.50.

The whole sweep of New Testament archæology (from coins to papyri) is adequately covered in this short Pathway Book. It will serve as an introduction to the subject for a church school teacher, perhaps as a source book for a class, or a review of the highlights for a minister. The work is enhanced by several charts and photographs.

The Christ of the Gospels. By William Beck. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959. 227 pp. $3.00.

Dr. Beck has attempted and succeeded in the difficult task of combining the gospels into a continuous story while at the same time presenting a fresh modern translation. His work is ideal for those who wish to feel the drama of the life of Jesus without the awkwardness and redundancy of a harmony of the Gospels. It would naturally reflect Dr. Beck's prejudices in the arrangement of material, especially in weaving into the synoptics John's material, but the advantages for classroom and devotional use far outweigh such criticisms.

Jesus and God's New People. By Howard Clark Kee. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 92 pp. $1.50.

Professor Kee, whose *Understanding the New Testament* has received a wide acceptance, presents a study of the four gospels in Westminster's Guides to the Bible Series. He discusses the "facts" of the gospels and the modern interpretation of miracles, demonology, resurrection

and other themes. He moves from the Gospel to the Gospels with the use of the documentary theory and form-criticism. Then comes a consideration of the individual gospels in light of their particular contributions and critical problems. Readers of the *Quarterly* will appreciate this introduction to modern New Testament scholarship presented in a non-technical language.

The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching. By ROBERT H. MOUNCE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 168 pp. $3.50.

Professor Mounce of Bethal College and Seminary gives an analysis of the role of preaching in the New Testament. He moves to the problem through a discussion of background material, the attitude of Jesus, and the later development of New Testament writers. While in agreement with Dodd in many areas, he does differ, for example, in his belief that Dodd makes too sharp a distinction between *kergyma* and *didache*, as serves as a corrective to Dodd's thesis. Mounce sees preaching as not merely communication, but as that which breaks down the barriers of time and space and brings the supreme event of Christ to the present. A stimulating study of preaching which will enrich the understanding of all who attempt to preach.

Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. By F. F. BRUCE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 82 pp. $2.50.

F. F. Bruce, noted conservative scholar, gives a brief survey of the Qumran exegetical problems. There were two elements in revelation: the "mystery" and *peser*, or official interpretation in light of contemporary events. Both must go together before a prophetic passage is clear. Bruce also provides a historical sketch of the sect, a discussion of the Zadokite Document, an analysis of the Messianic interpretations, including the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man. There is also an interpretation of Daniel and the final chapter on the relationship between the sects use of the Old Testament and that of the early Christians. His conclusion is that the New Testament used the Old with more regard for the historical situation. Especially interesting are the comparison and contrast of ideas in the early church and in Qumran, such as the "fulness of time" and Jesus as the instigator of a new exegesis. This work will be helpful not only to students of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but all those interested in hermeneutics.

The New Testament and Mythology. By BURTON H. THROCKMORTON, JR. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 255 pp. $4.50.

As the title suggests, Professor Throckmorton is concerned with the mythological (a myth is that form of representation in which the other worldly and divine appear as worldly and human) content of the New Testament and the attempt made by Rudolph Bultmann of Marburg to demythologize it. The author first deals

with Bultmann's system of hermeneutics, then presents his own criticisms, and finally his own interpretation of such topics as the virgin birth, crucifixion, and resurrection. Throckmorton feels that myths should not be eliminated because they are an essential part of the *kergyma* which can only use the language of myth for communication. The work presupposes a knowledge of the current controversy over demythologizing.

Helps From Hebrews. By Don Earl Boatman. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. 457 pp. $4.95.

The President of Ozark Bible College (Christian Church) gives the fruit of eight years of teaching Hebrews in college, as well as frequent expository sermons from Hebrews in a twenty-five year ministry, in what he calls a commentary, workbook and teacher's manual. The text is presented along with a paraphrase, then comments in outline form which are followed by study questions (nearly 2,000). At the end of the chapters are questions on the chapter and summaries. This suggests the reason for the massive size. Its greatest value would probably be for expository sermons (surely a ten year series). Summing up: ordeal by outline.

STUDY AIDS

The Cross-Reference Bible. Edited by Harold E. Monser. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. $14.95.

In this massive volume are combined the essential tools for a study of the Bible. Prepared for the average Bible student, it contains an analytical outline of every book in the Bible, the American Standard Text with important variant readings, a topical arrangement of subjects, and extensive marginal references to related material. An ideal volume for the church library and Bible teachers.

A Companion to the Bible. Edited by J. J. Von Allmen. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. 479 pp. $6.00.

Originally published in French (*Vocabulaire Biblique*)and written by French scholars, the *Companion* makes available for English readers a word book of Biblical Theology. It presents in more detail and gives a broader coverage than *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible* edited by Richardson (nearly 300 words are discussed directly or indirectly). The articles are concisely written, presented in logical outline, and reflect the best in Biblical scholarship. The *Companion* is an absolute necessity for every minister and serious student of the Bible.

GRACE AND ELECTION

The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. By T. F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 150 pp. $3.00.

In this small, scholarly work Torrance raises the question of the seeming unimportance attached to the doctrine of Grace by the Apostolic Fathers. He

finds that they departed from the New Testament emphasis because they had departed from the New Testament stress of the work and person of Christ. It was the concept of Law, not Grace, by which they described man's relationship with God.

The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth. By G. C. BERKOUWER. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956. 414 pp. (paperback). $2.45.

Although Barth is a widely influential theologian, his literary work is little known to the English public. G. C. Berkouwer, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Free University in Amsterdam and long an observer of Barth, sees in him a restoration of the doctrine of Grace to its rightful place in the thought of the church. The author, a theologian of international reputation, presents a fair and understanding appraisal. His work is an adequate introduction to Barth and a corrective to the interpretation of Van Til's *The New Modernism.* Originally written in Dutch many of the footnotes are thereby of limited value to the English reader.

Divine Election. By G. C. BERKOUWER. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 336 pp. $4.50.

This volume is the latest release in the Reformed Theologian's proposed twenty volume *Studies in Dogmatics* (seven are now in print. Here the great problems and impasses of the doctrine are considered. What is the difference between God's election and arbitrariness? Arbitrariness is a feature of man and cannot be projected to God. It is God's mercy and grace which free man from this characteristic. Is God's election hidden? No, it is always orientated toward revelation and election is "in Christ." Doesn't election ren der the preaching of the gospel meaningless? No, preaching is a witness to the world of God's f r e e mercy. Whatever one's views of election, this systematic presentation deserves to be read.

Predestination and Other Papers. By PIERRE MAURY. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. 109 pp. $2.50.

Pierre Maury, the late French pastor and theologian, is presented to the American public in this small volume on Predestination. His great ability to communicate, even with so difficult a subject, is apparent on every page. Predestination, or better election since the essay is Biblically centered, is frequently misunderstood because it is either considered in isolation or is approached philosophically. Jesus sums up in himself all of divine election since he is the fulfillment of the election of Israel and also the election of the church. Christ is both the chosen one of God and the one through whom God chooses. Any doctrine of election which sees Jesus as only the executor of God's choice is rejected by Maury as an election without Christology. As for the fallen and unrepentant who reject God's grace, it is impossible to give a judg-

ment of damnation for man cannot be certain as to the "how" of God's grace. The essay was written especially for the pastoral situation so the author cites the advantages of Predestination for the minister. These are an ability to believe for others who have apparently hardened their hearts (God's mercy is stronger than their resistance) and the ability to pray for others as well as ourselves. The work also contains as the "other papers" two sermons and two Christmas meditations. A preface is written by Karl Barth with whom the author was associated and to whom he is indebted.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility. By Richard M. Fagley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. 260 pp. $4.25.

The exploding birth rate (possible population of 3 billion by 1963, 6 billion by the turn of the century) is seen by Dr. Fagley as the chief enemy of free society. After a thorough discussion of the problem and its consequences, a survey is given of the Old Testament, New Testament, Judaism and the Early Church in their respective attitudes toward birth control. There is no exact Biblical sanction for birth control but it is justified in the fact that the New Testament makes companionship along with procreation as the ends of marriage. Included is a careful analysis of the position of the Roman Catholic Church and the current views in Protestantism. Dr. Fagley discusses the problem and the approach of the ecumenical movement which sees no hope without planned parenthood.

A Working Faith. By Joost De Blank. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 108 pp. $2.00.

A Working Faith is the title to a series of sermons by the Archbishop of Cape Town. Originally preached in different places over a period of time they have a unity through their relevancy to the modern scene. Although the English terminology occasionally seems strange, his messages cut through to expose the sins of the saints.

Sermons on the Prodigal Son. By Thomas A. Whiting. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 111 pp. $2.00.

The story of the Prodigal ranks as probably the greatest story Jesus ever told, in the opinion of the author. Using it as inspiration he builds twelve sermons around the points of flight, crisis, and return. An excellent and penetrating series which draws from literature and life to send home the thrust of Jesus' parable.

The Master's Men. By William Barclay. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 127 pp. $2.00.

William Barclay, who enjoys a wide audience here and in England, sketches for the reader the lives of the twelve apostles in sermons. He is obviously required to depend upon extra-canonical works for most of the

men. This, as all the author's works, makes interesting reading.

Sermons of Simon Peter. By CLOVIS G. CHAPPELL. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 128 pp. $2.00.

The Apostle Peter in his weakness and strength is painted by one of America's master sermonic artists. A refreshing approach which differs from other character sermons on Peter draws five of the twelve texts from the First Epistle of Peter.

Beneath the Cross of Jesus. By R. E. O. WHITE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 159 pp. $3.00.

Thirty-three short provocative essays written under the overshadowing cross. Dr. White, a British Baptist minister and scholar, writes in a devotionally moving style and provides the yeast for the leavening of a spiritless life.

In His Service. By LEWIS S. MUDGE. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 176 pp. $3.00.

From the conviction that the church must be the servant people of the servant Lord, the author challenges Christian faith into action. Especially provocative is the closing chapter on "The Service of the State." God's servants are those who look for, work for, the redemption of his people in any place or time.

Between God and Satan. By HELMUT THIELICKE. Grand Rapids: Wm. E. Eerdmans, 1958. 84 pp. $2.00.

Professor Thielicke, one of the outstanding preachers in Germany, presents a detailed study of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness against the background of other temptation stories in the Bible. Man, of course, stands between God and Satan. Man yields to temptation when he seeks to free himself of God.

The Praying Christ. By JAMES G. S. S. THOMSON. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 155 pp. $3.00.

The thesis of this short work is that the prayer life of Jesus should serve as the basis for the Christian's prayer life. To this end he has made a careful study of Jesus' teaching and practice of prayer. An excellent stimulus for the devotional life.

Three Defenses of Music in Worship Answered. By S. H. HALL. Athens, Alabama, 1960. 160 pp.

Reminiscence of three public discussions (Pendleton, Harrell, Walker) held by a pioneer preacher, S. H. Hall. An encyclopedia of arguments on the issue.

DIVIDED CHRISTENDOM

The Unity and Disunity of the Church. By G. W. BROMILEY. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958. 104 pp. $1.50.

In this book in the Pathway Series Professor Bromiley, presently at Fuller Theological Seminary, is concerned with the unity of the church. It is to be

achieved on the basis of Christology or "incarnational unity." As there is unity in Christian living through the acceptance of the dying-rising pattern, so this motif can also serve as the basis for unity in Christian thinking.

A Message to Catholics and Protestants. By OSCAR CULLMANN. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 57 pp. $1.50.

Cullmann observes that there is little hope of unity with Catholics since it is the doctrine of the church that separates Christendom. He suggests, in a series of lectures at various universities, that trust and confidence can be built up if Protestants and Catholics would take up collections for each other's poor. This practical suggestion of Cullmann's would result in a unity of charity.

A Protestant Speaks His Mind. By ILION T. JONES. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. 237 pp. $3.95.

Professor Jones of the San Francisco Theological Seminary expresses concern about the Protestant Catholic relationship. In the Ecumenical Movement he finds several disturbing tendencies, such as the concessions to Catholicism in the liturgical trend. He believes that cooperation with Catholicism is impossible because of the basic difference in doctrine. The Catholic church, the author feels, is actively concerned with American politics in every phase. He pleads with Protestantism to awake to the task. Readers of the *Quarterly* will appreciate his belief that the New Testament church is the pattern and not the post apostolic church which is the norm in much of the ecumenical movement.

OLD TESTAMENT

You Shall Be My People. By EDWIN M. GOOD. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 96 pp. $1.50.

The God who acts in history is the author's thesis in this account of the Pentateuch for the Westminster Guides to the Bible. In dealing with the Pentateuch Dr. Good accepts the oral traditionalists' position. There is a discussion of methodology in the early chapters of Genesis. Its special value is that it is a resume of the modern approach to the study of the Old Testament.

The Story of Israel: From Joshua to Alexander the Great. By STEPHEN SZIKSZAI. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 96 pp. $1.50.

Bangor Theological Seminary's Professor Szikszai gives a thumbnail sketch of Israel's history up to the coming of the Greeks. Another addition to the Guides series, it by necessity is brief but where there is need he slows down for an appraisal of the sources, archæology, and religious development.

The Threshold of Christianity. By LAWRENCE E. TOOMBS. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. $1.50.

Taking up where Szikszai left

off in his volume, Toombs discusses Inter-testamental Judaism in its historical and religious developments. It is an excellent survey of the period generally ignored by Christians.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Philosophy of Adult Christian Education. By DAVID J. ERNSBERGER. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 172 pp. $3.75.

The formulation of a working philosophy for adult education in the local church is the author's task. This is worked out in relation to three controlling factors. First is the role of the minister, his self-image, and his doctrine of the church. Then there are the basic needs of the layman. These increased by manipulative pressures to conform, the influence of mass media, and an indifference to theology and the Bible. The underlying problem for the layman is the sense of estrangement from God and his fellow man. The solution to man's need is best achieved in small study group. Ernsberger closes with an evaluation of group dynamics and the implications his approach to adult education will have for church organization.

Sunday School Worker's Training Course Vol. 1-4. By RAY H. HUGHES AND OTHERS. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. $1.75 each.

Four of the projected five volume series in teachers training program have been released by Baker Book House. The first volume is an Introductory Course which deals with basic organization of a Sunday School. In the second volume the role of the teacher is analyzed. In the third and fourth volumes the student and evangelism are considered. These books are elementary and non-technical and will be of greatest use with those newly recruited to the task of teaching.

The Minister in Christian Education. By PETER P. PERSON. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. 134 pp. $2.95.

Every possible area where the ministry might touch the educational program of a church is considered (including Youth Camps). The value is greatly increased by a list of suggested readings after every chapter.

The Study of the Acts of the Apostles Yesterday and Today

J. W. Roberts

The Book of Acts is the capstone of the New Testament. Whether its author designed it as such or not (as some modern scholars claim) it caps the arch formed by the four Gospels on the one side and the epistles on the other. Aside from the Gospel of Luke it is the longest book of the New Testament, and without it we would be completely in the dark as to the beginning and development of the early church.

Acts is also the key book in the study of the New Testament as a whole. A recent commentator has said

> Conclusions reached by a critic concerning the composition and historical value of Acts are likely to determine his views on the whole process of development, not only of the New Testament literature, but of primitive Christianity itself. Acts is thus the key book in the study of the New Testament, and to trace the successive theories held concerning it is to review the chief problems not only of the book itself but of the beginnings of Christianity.[1]

The aim of this article will be to trace the course of the study of Acts through the centuries, especially since the rise of historical criticism, to point to some of the more helpful bibliographical sources both for the study of that criticism and for helps in interpretation, and to set forth some of the conclusions concerning the book reached through the long process of its study.

Acts in the Early Church

The traces of Acts in the early years of the second century are not as detailed as for some of the other books of the N. T.[2] But they are adequate to the wide and early circulation of the book. Its fortune was tied up with that of Luke its companion volume. Since the two books are of common authorship in the view of practically all scholars,[3] the evidence for the one bears upon the genuineness of the other. The early attestation of Luke's Gospel is assured by the fact that Marcion abridged it in his edition of the New Testament, assuring us of its acceptance at Rome probably as

---

[1]G. H. C. Macgregor, "Acts Introduction," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 9 (New York and Nashville, Abingdon, 1954), p. 12.

[2]Polycarp most surely quotes Acts, incorporating the words of 2:24, "whom God raised up, loosing the pangs of Hades" (1.2). He has however changed the verb for "raised" (*anestasen to egeiren*). Ignatius (d. 117) has many reminders of Acts, though he seldom quotes specifically any of his sources. Cf. W. L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge, U. Press, 1948), pp. 1f.

[3]Only A. C. Clark among recent scholars has argued for separate authors for Luke-Acts. See his *The Acts of Apostles* (Oxford, 1933), 393ff. An effective reaction to his arguments may be seen in W. L. Knox's *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 2ff and 100 ff. Clark's arguments are linguistic. Knox's volume is a delightful little series of lectures of introductory nature.

early as the year 130. It was first ascribed to Luke by the churches at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul in an epistle to the churches of Asia Minor about A.D. 177. The bishop of Lyons, Pothinus, went back in his connection with the church to the early part of the second century. It was ascribed to Luke directly by Irenaeus, by Origen, and by the Muratorian Canon.

Similarly Acts itself is ascribed to Luke by those whose memory and life in the early church went back to the early days of the turn of the second century, by those who had been intimate with the companions of the apostles themselves.[4] Acts was ascribed to Luke in the letter mentioned above from the churches at Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia Minor.[5] Pothinus, the bishop of Lyons, takes the testimony for the book back to near the year 100 A.D. Irenaeus specifies Luke as the author.[6] The Muratorian Canon (ca. 170 A.D.) says, "The Acts of all the Apostles are written in a single book. Luke compiled for 'most excellent Theophilus' everything that happened in detail in his presence." Similar statements are found in Tertullian, who described it as a "commentary of Luke" and Clement of Alexandria said, "Luke in the Acts of the Apostles records that Paul said, Ye men of Athens . . ."[7] Jerome says that Luke being learned in this Gospel as well as in Acts of Apostles used Greek quotations rather than Hebrew.[8]

We know nothing of the immediate situation surrounding the publication of Acts. Some of the theories of modern scholars concerning this will be mentioned later.

After the close of the second century Acts did not fare as well in popularity as did other portions of the New Testament. According to Chrysostom (347-407) Acts was appointed to be read in the churches beginning at Easter in his section. We have evidence that this was done at Antioch[9] and in North Africa.[10]

Yet at Constantinople Chrysostom complained that it seemed that

---

[4]For an effective statement of the force of this evidence see G. T. Stokes in the introduction to his commentary on Acts in the *Expositor's Bible*, pp. 3-11. For detailed treatments of the early testimony concerning Acts see Geo. Salmon, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the N. T.* (London, 1891), pp. 294-324, and Westcott, *On the Canon of the New Testament* (London and Cambridge, 1866), *passim.*

[5]Eusebius, *H. E.*, 5. 1.

[6]*Against Heresies*, III, 1, 2; III, 13, 3; See also, III, 14, 1f. The entire texts are given in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (N. Y. and London, 1921-33, V vols.), Vol. II, pp. 212ff.

[7]*Miscellanies*, V. 12. See the text in *Beginnings*, Vol. II, p. 221. Also *Adumbr.* in 1 Peter (*Ibid.*): "Luke is recognized to have described with his pen the Acts of the Apostles."

[8]Commentary on Isa. 3:6. See also Epistle 20:4; 43:9. *Lives of Illustrious Men*, vii (*Beginnings*, Vol. II, p. 235ff).

[9]Chrysostom, Homily *Cur in Pentecoste Acts Legantur.* Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae*, Vol. 51, 101-112.

[10]Augustine, *Tractate on John*, VI. 18 "Read in church every year."

in some churches the book was not read "from year to year."[11] Some thought the book "plain." Again the same author complained that the book was so little known "both it and its author that they are not even aware that there is such a book in existence."[12]

Jerome is also said to have remarked that men of his day did not read Acts because it was "naked history."[13]

The view of the church of the first centuries as well as the traditional view of the church concerning the book through the Middle Ages and the Reformation was that it was written at Rome by Luke, the companion of Paul, as the second part of his treatise to Theophilus for the purpose of instructing him in the things received among the Christians and of assuring him of the certainty of the faith (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-2). Received as a genuine document composed by the companion of the apostle its trustworthiness was not questioned.

The traditional view of the purpose which Luke had in writing was that the purpose was largely historical. But McGiffert is certainly wrong when he says that the traditional view saw the book as "wholly historical, to recount the achievements of the apostles, or the history of the early church, as the Gospels had recounted the words and the works of Christ."[14] The inadequacy of this point is seen when McGiffert goes on to claim that this view that Acts was "wholly historical" remained unchanged until historical criticism began to scrutinize the book. It was then that it was revealed that the book fulfilled in a very imperfect way that historical purpose, since "it confined itself almost exclusively to Peter and Paul" and had many omissions, repetitions, and much sketchiness in some parts and detail in others.

Modern criticism cannot rightly claim such discoveries as its own or claim them as the foundation of a new point of view. Ancient authors were more critical than they are given credit for. Chrysostom in his opening homily on Acts noted these very things mentioned by McGiffert and attempted to account for them.[15] The imbalance mentioned above he attributed to Luke's association with Paul, and he explained the fact that Luke did not relate "everything" by the sufficiency of the material he did use to "matters of immediate importance." What these matters were Chrysostom did not say, though the thought that one of the author's main purposes was to select materials which would serve to demonstrate the resurrection.[16] Another purpose which he attributed to Luke was to show the workings of the Holy Spirit in the church.[17] The prominence of Peter in

---

[11]A.D. 387 *In Principium Actorum.* t. iii. p. 54.

[12]Homily on Acts 1:1-2.

[13]A. C. Winn, "Elusive Mystery, The Purpose of Acts," *Interpretation* Vol. XIII, No. 2 (1959), p. 144.

[14]A. C. McGiffert, "The Historical Criticism of Acts in Germany," *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. II, p. 363.

[15]Compare *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. XI* (Eerdman's reprint, 1956), p. 2. [16]*Ibid.*, p. 3. [17]*Ibid.*, p. 18.

the first part of Acts before the conversion of Paul Chrysostom explained by the "precedence in honor" given Peter by Christ.[18] Finally Chrysostom appealed to two main facts which make Acts worthy of study: as summarized by Geo. G. Stevens in his note on this passage in Schaff these are: (1) the continuity of the history as connected with the Gospels, shown particularly by the coincidence of style, subject matter, and diction; and (2) The remarkable undesigned coincidences of statement between Acts and the Pauline Epistles which exclude the possibility of interdependence. "These," says Dr. Stevens, are "the two chief grounds upon which modern criticism depends for establishing not only the general trustworthiness of the book but also its authorship by Luke."[19] Such criticism then was quite modern!

Commentaries of the Renaissance period noted the existence of lacunae in the sequence of events in the book as well as the fact that the history concerned mostly the acts of the two apostles Peter and Paul.[20] Calvin is more interested in theology and takes little interest in the critical aspects of the book. Luther is said to have seen the writing of Acts a vindication of Paul's doctrine of justification of all men by faith.

Following the Reformation other writers noted the peculiarities of Acts and tried to explain the purpose of the author within the framework of its genuineness. Hugo Grotius, the great Dutch lawyer and theologian (1583-1645), considered the book to be a parallel type of biography in the manner of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*.[21] J. D. Michaelis (1717-1791) maintained that Acts was intended by Luke to be a trustworthy account of the work of the Spirit and miraculous workings of the early preachers and intended to demonstrate that the heathen had a right to the gospel in spite of the opposition of the Jews. Griesbach (1745-1812) along with his colleague Paulus explained the book as Paul's defense of his preaching especially against the attacks of the Judaisers. Karl F. Eichhorn (1781-1854) held that the purpose of the book was to give a history of Christian Missions, tracing the spread of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Antioch and finally to Rome. Others to deal with the problem were G. Frisch and Karl Augustus Credner.

The significance of these efforts is not in their solutions to the problems or in the fact that they failed to agree. Some of these attempts tended toward rationalism and some tended to throw doubt upon the accuracy of Luke's facts. But they illustrate that the phenomena for which the critical schools were later to offer their solutions were well known before Baur. It was thus the rise not so much of a school of critics with more critical acumen as some

---

[18]*Ibid.* [19]*Ibid.*, p. 2.

[20]See the statement in *A Religious Encyclopaedia* (N. Y., Funk & Wagnalls, 1882), article "Acts of Apostles."

[21]For a summary of the pre-Tuebingen treatment of Acts compare McGiffert, *Ibid.*, pp. 364-367 and Macgregor, *Ibid.*, 12-15.

with more radical presuppositions that caused Acts to be shorn of its genuineness and trustworthiness.

The Rise of the Tendency School

A new viewpoint is met in Matthias Schneckenburger (1804-1848) who published a book on the purpose of Acts at Bern, Switzerland in 1841. Concerning him Macgregor says:

> With Schneckenburger (1841) we meet for the first time the view that the author's motive is not primarily historical; he writes in interest of a particular "tendency" and to serve certain apologetic purposes. These are in the main two: (a) To conciliate as far as possible the prejudice of Jewish Christians against Paul. This he does by stressing the unity and solidarity of the Petrine and Pauline wings of the church, and by exaggerating the parallelism between the careers of the two apostles. (b) A subsidiary political motive—to prove that there had never been any real cause of conflict between the growing Christian church and the Roman authorities. While stressing the controversial aims of the author, Schneckenburger maintained that Luke's facts, generally speaking, were reliable, and that he did not seriously falsify history in the interests of his apologetic.[22]

It was the school of Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) which first maintained that the author of Acts could not have been Luke and that it had no claim to historical trustworthiness. Baur was imbued with a Hegelian philosophy of history which supposed that established social groups arose through an evolutionary process of a resistence (an antithesis) to an established culture (a thesis) resulting eventually in a new culture (a synthesis). Baur thought that the thesis of early Christianity was a Jewish or Petrine party against which there arose a Hellenistic or Pauline party. The synthesis achieved in the second century resulted when the two groups found themselves confronted with a mutually antagonist party —the Gnostics. This synthesis is what the historian now calls the "old" catholic church of the empire days.

Baur taught that Acts (along with all the "Pauline" epistles except Romans, Galatians, and the Corinthian epistles) were spurious. This literature was supposed to have arisen somewhere near the middle of the second century and represented a kind of "irenic" or "peace" effort written to cover up the division which was thought to have existed in the actual period covered by the Acts. Tendency criticism had come of age.

Baur's work was continued by his disciples Albert Schwegler and Eduard Zeller. Zeller, who was Baur's son-in-law, authored what has been described as the "most elaborate critique of the Acts that has appeared" and also as the "classic presentation of the Tuebingen theory of early Christianity as applied to Acts."

Later critics to follow Baur's reconstruction of Christian Origins were Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, and Volkmar, to name only a few. In

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

England the theory was set forth by Samuel Davidson[23] and W. R. Cassels.[24] The traditional view was not without its able supporters in Germany. Johann August Wilhelm Neander, "the father of modern church history," S. J. Baumgarten, John Peter Lange, editor of the well-known Lange's Commentary, and Theo. Zahn, to name a few.

Following the excesses of the Tuebingen school a reaction set in in Germany. The reaction was represented by the works of F. C. Overbeck, Bruno Bauer, Otto Pfleiderer, August Sabatier, and Edouard Reuss. The tendency was still to consider Acts a second-century work but to reject the idea of a purposeful deception in favor of the idea that the writer wrote of the early period from a supposition of how Christianity arose after the synthesis had already occurred and the knowledge of the true history had been forgotten. Reuss' position Macgregor says[25] may be stated thus:

> Acts cannot be considered a book of pure history, for certain facts have been chosen and arranged in order to combat the prejudice against Paul, and to render Paulinism, and particularly its universalism, more acceptable in Jewish eyes. But there has been no systematic and conscious distortion of history. This indeed was the position reached by criticism by the end of the century. Acts may represent an apology for Paul from the point of view of a disciple.

The English Scene

The early English works on Acts dealing with the questions of its origin and genuineness came from the struggle with the Deists in the 18th century. The work of the great apologetic writer William Paley, *Horae Paulinae* (1790) may be taken as an example. He dealt with the "undesigned coincidences" between Acts and the Epistles of Paul. Though some of his positions have to be modified, his work still stands as one of interest and information. The critics who place the composition of Acts in the second century must simply ignore the argument based on this evidence.

Mention might well be made of the best of the standard English commentaries published before the storm of the critical battle reached England. The best were those of Henry Alford,[26] of C. J. Elliott,[27] of Christopher Wordsworth,[28] and of E. H. Giffort and T. S. Evans (*Speaker's Commentary*).[29] They were written in the best English style of "painstaking exegesis" and "minute and careful scrutiny" of the language.

In related fields to that of the commentaries one finds equally able and justifiably famous works which bear on the Acts produced

---

[23]*An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (Vol .II, 1868), pp. 275ff. [24]*Supernatural Religion* (1874, Vol. III), Part I.
[25]*Ibid.*, p. 13.
[26]*The New Testament in Greek*, 4 Vols. (1841-61). This set has been recently reprinted in a one volume English edition by Eerdman's in this country.
[27]Andover, Warren Draper, 1879. [28]London, 1881. [29]1881.

during this period. Among these might be mentioned an essay on "The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul"[30] by a yachtsman and eminent geologist, James Smith, "which is of permanent value as a demonstration that the twenty-seventh chapter of Acts was written by an eye-witness and a landsman."[31] 1852 saw the publication of the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* by Conybeare and Howson, one of the first works to synchronize the information in Acts and the Epistles of Paul. This is a book which is still valuable. A similar work was *The Life and Work of St. Paul* by F. W. Farrar (1879), described as the "ablest and most thorough of all his works" and a companion to his treatment of the life of Christ and another on the later New Testament history: *The Early Days of Christianity.* All these works were typical of the older scholarship in England based upon wide, if uncritical by later standards, scholarship.

1874 ushered in a new era of study. That year W. R. Cassels published anonymously a two-volume work entitled *Supernatural Religion, An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation* in which the assumptions and arguments of Baur were presented in such a way as to come home to the English people. The debate was immediately joined by J. B. Lightfoot who answered the book in a series of articles in the Contemporary Review which were later published as a book under the title *Essays on Supernatural Religion.* In the same journal for 1878 Lightfoot prepared a paper on "Discoveries Illustrating the Acts of Apostles" in which he worked out the difficulty of an anonymous second-century writer's accidental accuracy in describing the complicated system of government and the social environment that the developing science of archæology was beginning to uncover.[32] Lightfoot's series of Commentaries on Paul's epistles with their painstaking dissertations along with his major contribution in the field of the Church Fathers represented the answer of British scholarship to the Tuebingen criticism.

The further rehabilitation of Acts (as it has been called) was carried on by the great work of Sir William Ramsay, whose work on the archæology of Asia Minor has been described as "among the three or four best things done by an Englishman in the field of scientific scholarship in this generation."[33] Ramsay started out a

---

[30]First published as an essay in 1848. [31]Hunkin, *op. cit.*, p. 415.

[32]This is the same argument developed in Dr. Salmon's *Introduction* and in the many works of Sir William Ramsay, e.g., *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (1890), *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170* (1893), *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (1895), *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1899) and numerous articles in *The Expositor.*

Lately the argument has been repeated in force by Henry J. Cadbury in *The Book of Acts in History* (London, A & C Black, 1955). This writer heard Cadbury deliver the lectures in this book at Southern Methodist University. He said then that if he were a conservative, he would consider them "strongly apologetic."

[33]Quoted by Hunkin from the *Expositor*, 1891 (Series IV, No. 3, pp. 232ff.

skeptic and was converted by his own researches to the view of the genuineness and trustworthiness of Acts. One of Ramsay's greatest contributions was his suggestion concerning the identification of the churches of Galatia as the churches of the first missionary tour of Paul (the South Galatian Theory).

Back in Germany once more the contemporary character of the writing of Acts and its general trustworthiness were championed from the turn of the century on down by such writers as Johannes Weiss and Adolf Harnack. Harnack in his books (*Luke the Physician*, tr. 1907; *The Acts Of Apostles*, tr. 1909; and *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, tr. 1911) defended the Lukan authorship of Acts and its general accuracy, though he would admit errors in detail. He saw the work as Luke's demonstration that the work of the church was a prolongation of the ministry of the Lord. Weiss thought that many of the sources identifiable in Acts were early and generally reliable, though he put the editing of it down to a date around A.D. 90 which, of course, puts it too late for Luke. Weiss saw in the book an apology addressed to the Romans and directed against the Jews.[34]

The Beginnings of Christianity

The "rehabilitation of Acts" had been to some extent accomplished through the works of such scholars as Harnack, and Ramsay when the monumental work, *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of Apostles* (5 Vols.) (1920-33, Macmillan)[35] appeared. The editors of the work were F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. The project as the title indicates originally was intended to stretch beyond the period of Acts, but it has never been completed beyond Part I and is not likely to be now that both editors and most of the contributors are gone.

The five volumes of this work are divided as follows: Vols. I and II are given to introduction or prolegomena, such as the Graeco-Roman background and the history of the critical study of the book. Vol. III is entitled "The Text of Acts" and was edited by James H. Ropes. Volume IV contains a new translation and commentary by Lake and H. J. Cadbury. Vol. V contains thirty-seven special articles or dissertations on special subjects connected with the study of Acts. One who has never used this series can scarcely imagine what a wealth of information is contained in these encyclopædic volumes.

In spite of its helpfulness however the work raised again the question of the authorship, reliability, and purpose of the author of Acts. Both "The Case for Tradition" (C. W. Emmet) and "The

---

[34]Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, 2 Vols., Tr. with new introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant. (N. Y., Harper Torchbooks, 1959) Original English translation entitled *The History of Primitive Christianity*, 1937.

[35]See the fine analysis of this work by F. F. Bruce in *Interpretation*, XIII, No. 2, April, 1959, pp. 131-134.

Case Against Tradition" (H. Windisch) were given. But the position of doubt was given a disproportionate amount of treatment. Also Windisch's position represented the opinion of the editors. The positions maintained were (1) that the "we" sections must be separated from the other material used by the author. (These sections may have been written by Luke or some other companion of Paul.)[36] (2) The author was unfamiliar with the general trend of Primitive Christianity and unhistorically represented the twelve as the originators of the Mission to the Gentiles, (3) The author presents an unreal picture of Paul because of a mistaken opinion that complete harmony prevailed between Paul and the Twelve.[37]

About the same time (1921-23) these conclusions of the contributors of the *Beginnings of Christianity* were somewhat counter-

---

[36]This survey is not the place to attempt any analysis of these arguments. Yet a recent rereading of Windisch's article impresses this writer with the fact that the arguments made are mostly revampings of the earlier "radical theories" with a different starting point and the same conclusion. Most of the points made are highly subjective and subject to quite different logical interpretations. As a sample, note his arguments against the Lucan authorship of the "we" sections. He argues from how he *feels* that Luke must have written had he been the author: e.g., He must have told how he joined Paul's company and what became of him. He states that the story of the Jailer at Philippi is not credible or consistent (no evidence given). The account of the journeys of Paul and Silas (Acts 17:14ff; 18:5) are incorrect as appears from 1 Thess. 2:14; 3:1ff (The possibility that the narratives could be supplementary is not considered). The speech of Paul at Athens is "unlikely" for Paul. Paul's speech at Miletus to the elders "seems improbable." The "we" sections mention the money collection of Paul's third journey merely as "an afterthought," whereas in the epistles of Paul it was "significant." The accounts of the conversion of Paul differ and are "probably legendary." Windisch twice asserts that in one place "Luke" affirms that Paul received his call to be an apostle to the Gentiles from Ananias while at other times Acts has him receiving it from the Lord himself (1) at his conversion, and (2) in a vision (as though the Lord could not have repeated the work cut out for him). The reader may consult the accounts of Acts 9, 22, and 26 to see for himself if there is anything in the three stories of Paul's conversion from the lips of Ananias about Paul's call to be an "apostle to the Gentiles." On Windisch's whole article see W. L. Knox, *op. cit.*, passim.

[37]We have practically the same reasons set forth for denying the Lucan authorship in one of the most recent German commentaries: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, by Ernst Haenchen (Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959). "The main reasons that Luke could not have written the book according to him, are (1) the author and Paul have different understandings of the Gentile mission, (2) The picture of Paul in Acts does not agree with that of Paul himself (Acts, for example, presents Paul as a great miracle worker, characteristics which we do not find Paul ascribing to himself), (3) Acts does not show the same relationship between the Gentiles and Jews that we find in Paul," From Abe Malherbe's review of Haenchen's book in the *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 4 (1960), No. 1, pp. 51-54.

balanced by the more constructive work of Eduard Meyer who demanded that Luke's work be treated as that of any other historian —e.g., that of a Livy or a Polybius.[38]

And so the debate has gone with no assured result or unanimity among the critics. Nor have the latter decades changed the picture greatly. Sample views might be taken in the points of view of Edgar J. Goodspeed and John Knox. Goodspeed held that the occasion for the publication of Luke-Acts was the publication of the collected epistles of Paul and that this probably took place somewhere around 90 A.D.[39] Knox has taken the position that Acts is a "Gospel" plus "Apostle" compilation answering the canon of Marcion and appearing about 150 A.D.[40] Here the term "Gospel" represents Marcion's official Gospel which he compiled from Luke's Gospel, and the "Apostle" represents his official list of Paul's epistles. Now as Marcion had set forth such groupings, the church was forced to follow suit with what it considered the true "Gospel" and "Apostle." After this was done (according to Knox) Acts was brought forth (by whom he does not say) to tie the two parts of the canon together. Thus Knox would discount the early testimony to Acts, holding that the points of contact with the Church Fathers are merely seeming and leaving unexplained (1) how the church could have accepted so rapidly and universally a spurious book, and (2) how to account for the unusual accuracy of detail which the historical apologetic has demonstrated. See the critique of this work by N. B. Stonehouse, *Westminster Theological Journal,* VI (1943), pp. 95ff.

All the criticisms continue to project the thought that the book is a vindication of the apostleship of Paul. As Bruce has pointed out,[41] the book itself does not demonstrate that this is its purpose. It may eventually have proved a vindication of Paul's action, it may have served to contrast or parallel the faithfulness and mutual harmony of Paul and the twelve, but is not written as though that were its purpose.

The Purpose of Acts

Those who accept Acts as a product of Luke and believe in its credibility face the problem of the purpose of the book no less than the rest. Most of those who believe in its genuineness and who have given thought to the question concede that the book is chiefly historical, if not wholly so. But most of them would argue that his-

---

[38] *Ursprung und Anfaenge des Christentums* (Berlin, 1921-23), 3 vols. A recent survey of opinions on the authorship is to be found in *Les Problems du Livre des Acts d'apres Les Travaux recents* (Louvain, 1950), pp. 17ff. Reference to this work has been observed in several books, though this writer has not seen it.

[39] *The Formation of the New Testament Canon* (Chicago, 1926), p. 75.

[40] *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago, 1942), pp. 119ff.

[41] *The Book of Acts, New International Commentary* (Eerdman's, 1956), p. 18.

tory can be selective, so long as the "cutting" of events does not falsify the total picture.[42]

The investigations into the motive or purpose of the author are varied. The following reconstruction of F. F. Bruce in his commentary in the *New International Commentary on the New Testament* seems to commend itself: the purpose

> cannot be considered in isolation from the purpose of the "former treatise" of which it is the continuation. The two parts are parts of an integral whole, with a coherent purpose running throughout. . . He claims for his account that it rests upon thorough and accurate research and that it is arranged in a proper sequence. . . Luke, then, announces that his purpose in writing his *History* was to give a certain Theophilus an accurate and orderly account of the origins of Christianity, about which Theophilus had some information already.

The certainty which Luke desires Theophilus to have from his study of Luke's work would necessarily come about only when that account was directed at removing whatever might have caused one to doubt or question its claimed origin and status. Fulfilling this need accounts for the selection of materials in the book and enables us to trace certain "emphases" in the book.[43] Bruce points out that partly these are apologetic. Since the founder of the Christian system had died a criminal's death and since there were allegations that Christians were guilty of unlawful activity, to show that it was not an unlawful movement it was necessary to show that Jesus' death had been itself unlawfully carried out at the instigation of the Jewish authorities and that in its early history Christianity's right to exist had been recognized by all Roman authorities and in accordance with due process of Roman law. In order to fix the blame for the strife which did constantly attend the new church the author is forced to show that the trouble was caused by the Jewish communities who refused to accept the Gospel as God's revelation and the legitimate outcome of the faith of the Fathers and who were annoyed when their Gentile neighbors believed it.

Bruce points out that other emphases also may be accounted for. If Theophilus was a convert to the faith or was merely an interested investigator, Luke wished "to make it clear that the progress of this faith was no mere question of human planning: it was controlled by the divine agency." This would account for the continued emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit. Other types of apologies are found in the book. Stephen's speech in Chapter 7 (and Paul's

---

[42]That Charles and Mary Beard are writing "history" when they marshal the details of American history in expounding an economic thesis in their *The Rise of American Civilization* (N. Y., Macmillan, 1930) one could hardly deny. Beard would hardly contend that this was the only motive in the development of our institutions or that this "told all" in the story of America.

[43]On the different themes or emphases of Acts compare the excellent article "Elusive Mystery, the Purpose of Acts" by Albert C. Winn, in *Interpretation,* XIII, No. 2, April, 1959, pp. 144-156.

in Chapter 13) is the prototype of Christian apologetic against the Jews, designed to show that Christianity and not Judaism is the true fulfillment of the revelation given through Moses. Paul's Athenian experience contains an early example of the apologetic against Paganism "designed to show that the true knowledge of God is given in the gospel and not in the idolatrous vanities of paganism." Paul's defense in Acts 26 is "the crowning *apologia* for his own missionary carecr."[44]

Prof. Burton Scott Easton in an unusually penetrating book edited after his death by F. C. Grant entitled *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts*[45] emphasized an aspect overlooked in most of the discussions read by this writer; that is, the didactic purpose of the history contained in Acts. Luke admittedly wrote for more people than Theophilus, and he wrote that they might understand the nature of Christianity as he understood it. Easton thinks that he conceived of his audiences on the whole as unlearned and he thinks that this accounts especially for the many repetitions in the book, "the juxtaposition of the great number of separate sections, each of which is complete within itself."[46] He thinks this also accounts for the simplification in the plan of the book (Jerusalem to Rome), in its biography, and in its chronology. In this way is explained the didactic nature of the speeches. Even the miracles are seen as a part of Luke's plan of edification: he really believed that Christianity was a supernatural religion.

T. E. Page[47] similarly contends that Acts is neither bare history, a dogmatic treatise, nor a biography, but a combination of all three. He asserts that the main object is historical, "to describe the growth of the Christian Church from small beginnings in Jerusalem until it reaches Rome." A second object along with this outward growth is to show the inward growth. Christianity is shown to be independent of Judaism and to belong to all who believe on the Lord Jesus. "As it is to be universal in its extension, so it is universal in its character." Thirdly, the book exhibits a keen personal interest in Paul and not improbably in Peter, which gives to some of the book a biographical cast. "If as a full record of Paul's life, the account is imperfect, none the less, as a record of his activity in making Christ's kingdom truly catholic . . . it is absolutely complete."

English Commentaries

It has been said[48] that the three best commentaries on Acts of Apostles in English are those of R. B. Rackham in the Westminster

---

[44]Bruce, *Ibid.*, p.

[45]London, SPCK, 1955. The point on which Easton seems to go too far is in attributing a different theology to Paul and the author of Acts. [46]*Ibid.*, p. 5.

[47]*The Acts of the Apostles* (London, Macmillan, 1930), pp. xxii-xxxvii.

[48]J. W. Hunkin, *Beginnings*, Vol. II, p. 396.

Series,[49] of T. E. Page,[50] and of Professor R. J. Knowling in the *Expositor's Greek Testament.*[51] Acts is the only N. T. book left uncovered in the *International Critical Commentary.*

Through the years since Hunkin wrote, the commentaries have continued to pour forth from the presses. Among those not previously mentioned that this writer has found helpful one might mention that of A. W. F. Blunt in the Clarendon Bible Series.[52] It is based upon the English text; has an adequate introduction and is interspersed with numerous illustrations to add interest to its comments. F. J. Foakes-Jackson writes the volume on Acts in the Moffatt series.[53] It is based on the text of Moffatt's translation and is intended for the non-technical reader. It has many things to recommend it, especially its treatment of the problems of Acts, though written from a very critical point of view. Two commentaries intended for general use are those of J. A. Findlay[54] and of R. R. Williams.[55] Williams' belongs to the *Torch Bible Commentaries.*

Two commentaries of special importance are those of F. F. Bruce of the University of Manchester, England, editor of the *Evangelical Quarterly.* The first *The Acts of the Apostles* was based upon the Greek text; the latter based on the English text is entitled *Commentary on the Book of Acts,* a volume in the *New International Commentary on the New Testament.*[56] Bruce's broad scholarship, his acquaintance with the scholarly works on Acts, and his conservative treatment make these commentaries very useful.

Other very recent commentaries are those of Haenchen (already mentioned), of C. S. C. Williams, and of Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle. Williams' belongs to the *Black's New Testament Commentaries* (*Harper's* in the USA); that of Carter and Earle to *The Evangelical Bible Commentaries.* These three books have been reviewed in the *Restoration Quarterly* (Volume 4, No. 1). Mention ought to be made especially of Macgregor's commentary in the *Interpreter's Bible* (Vol. 9) which has been frequently mentioned in this survey and which this writer has found to be very helpful on many points. After careful discussion in the introduction it adopts the hypothesis of a common Lukan authorship of Luke-Acts. An interesting new translation with introduction and notes will be found in paper-back Penguin Series by C. H. Rieu.

---

[49]*The Acts of the Apostles* (London, Methuen, 13th Ed., 1947).

[50]First published in 1886. The writer's copy of 1930 is the 12th reprint. It is similar in style to the *Cambridge Greek Testament* Series with the Greek text of Westcott and Hort printed and notes given in comment of selected points.

[51]London and N. Y., Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.

[52]Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922.

[53]London and N. Y., Harpers, 1931. [54]SCM Press, London, 1934.

[55]*The Acts of the Apostles* (SCM Press, London, 1953).

[56]See these volumes reviewed by Frank Pack in *Restoration Quarterly,* Vol. 1, No. 3, 1957, pp. 144f.

The churches of Christ have produced little effort on the study of Acts since beginning of the Restoration Movement. Professor J. W. McGarvey wrote his first commentary on Acts when a young man (published 1862). McGarvey subjected the book to thorough revision especially in the light of the rise of Baur's criticism and brought out the revised New Commentary on Acts in 1892.[57] David Lipscomb, editor of the *Gospel Advocate,* published another intended for family and school use.[58] The most recent volume on Acts is that of H. Leo Boles in the Lipscomb-Shepherd Series.[59]

Some Special Problems

There are some special problems in Acts which deserve mention for the sake of orientating the student and indicating the direction the problem is now taking. A few of these will be noticed briefly.

The Athenian Visit of Paul (Acts 17). Paul's visit to Athens as it is recorded in Acts 17 has become one of the most discussed points in Luke's history. Scholars have been diametrically opposed in their views of the visit and speech. Curtius, Blass, E. Meyer (all classical scholars of repute) defended the account as genuine.[60] B. W. Bacon thought that this rather than the speech of chapter 13 was typically Pauline.[61] Percy Gardner thought that it differed too greatly from Romans 1 to be genuine and called it the "least authentic of the Pauline discourses in Acts."[62]

More recently the whole account has been pointedly attacked on several grounds by E. Norden in *Agnostos Theos*[63] and M. Dibelius in his *Paulus auf dem Areopag* and *Paulus in Athen*[64] and in the paper "Paul on the Areopagus" in the collection of papers published in English under the title *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles.*[65] Strong defenses have been offered to the trustworthiness of the Athens visit by A. B. Bruce, *The Speeches in Acts*[66] and N. B. Stonehouse, *Paul before the Aeropagus.*[67] On the speech see the article by Roy Bowen Ward in this issue of this journal.

The Medical Language of Luke. In 1882 W. K. Hobart of Dublin published the results of research he had done on *The Medical Language of St. Luke.*[68] In this he attempted to show that a comparison with the medical terminology of Galen and other ancient writers

---

[57]Cincinnati, Standard Pub. Co. It has gone through many printings.

[58]*A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville, McQuiddy Pub. Co., 1896). [59]Nashville, Gospel Advocate Co., 1941.

[60]Cadbury, *Beginnings,* Vol. V, p. 406.

[61]*The Story of St. Paul* (London, 1905), p. 164.

[62]*Cambridge Biblical Essays,* Ed. by H. B. Sweet (Cambridge, 1909), p. 401. [63]Leipzig, 1912.

[64]Heidelburg, 1939 and Berlin, 1939.

[65]London, SCM Press, 1956. [66]London, 1942.

[67]Grand Rapids, Eerdman's, 1957.

[68]Hodges, Figgis, and Co. A reprint was published by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1954.

demonstrated that the writer of Luke-Acts was a physician. This argument received favorable adoption by Harnack and Zahn. But Cadbury and George F. Moore of Harvard countered by trying to show that the argument broke down under a demonstration that the terms used by Galen and others in common with Luke-Acts were about equally prevalent in non-medical writers.[69] An attempt has been made to salvage the argument by showing that its full force is not in the use of words but in "medical interest." Compare A. T. Robertson, *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research.*[70] Even Macgregor feels the force of this fact and presents evidence for it. He also states that the argument would probably have general admission were it not that many scholars already are prejudiced against the Lukan authorship of Luke-Acts.[71]

Dependence of Josephus. Several scholars have endeavored to show that Luke knew and used the works of the Jewish historian Josephus. The most detailed treatment of the problem is by Max Krenkel, *Josephus and Lukas.*[72] Since the *Antiquities* is the work in question and since it is dated in the decade of 90 A.D., this has important bearing on the dating and authorship of Acts. Two points of history are involved: the rebellions of Theudas and Judas (Acts 5:36-37), which is put by Luke's account at a different time from the same incidents in Josephus, and the notice about Lysanias as Tetrarch of Abilene (3:1). It has been supposed that Luke misunderstood Josephus. Others (e.g., Macgregor) have suggested that both may have used a common source and that Luke has equal or better claim to be considered as the one making accurate use of his source. There is also the possibility of double governorships or insurrections in the case of those involved. The facts are actually questionable. See McGarvey's comment *in loco.* Another such "misunderstanding" of Josephus is connected with Acts 21:38. On which see the commentaries.

Reminiscences of the language of Josephus are alleged. Compare, e.g., "I refuse not to die, if Justice so require" (*Life*, 29) and Paul's "For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die" (Acts 25:11). It seems strange that critics who are sure that such similarities are evidence of direct borrowing at the same time disallow much stronger similarities between Luke's language and that of Polycarp, Ignatius, and others. The writer in *Beginnings of Christianity* concedes that the evidences in question "fall just short of demonstration." That is about where the discussion stands today among most critics.

---

[69]*Harvard Studies*, VI, Part I, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke and The Making of Luke-Acts.* "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts," *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLV (1926), pp. 190-209.

[70]N. Y., Scribner's, 1920, pp. 90ff. [71]*Op. Cit.*, p. 8.

[72]Leipzig: Haessel, 1894. Macgregor calls this work "an outstanding example of perverse ingenuity applied to New Testament scholarship," *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Conclusion

Though neglected in the ancient church, The Acts of the Apostles has been the center of the most thorough investigation and study in modern times. Critical investigation has tended to re-establish the traditional confidence in the trustworthiness of the book. Apart from critical theories the book has a powerful thrust. It tells a gripping story of the spread of the gospel from its beginning in the name of Jesus to its taking deep roots in the imperial capital. In its story of the outward reach of the news of the Messiah it is a story to be re-enacted even in our own day. We are profoundly grateful to its author and to the Spirit of the Living God who prompted that writer so that we might "know the certainty concerning the things in which we were instructed."

The Speeches of Acts in Recent Study

Roy Bowen Ward

Introduction

The discussion of the speeches in Acts is one aspect—if not the most important aspect—of the larger discussion of the historical value of the Acts of the Apostles.

The Tuebingen School, under the leadership of F. C. Baur, held that the author of Acts deliberately composed this book with the aim of "harmonizing" the real diversity that existed in the early church. Written late in the second century, Acts was said to reflect the situation of the second century, rather than the first, and thus it was held to be an unreliable source for the period it covers.[1]

Although the hyper-critical view of Baur has few proponents on the modern scene, his work did leave its mark on modern scholarship. As A. C. Headlam put it, "The school of Baur had the great merit of establishing the fact that the Acts is an artistic whole."[2] But precisely in what sense was the author an "artist"? Did his artistic skill—to which so much modern scholarship has been devoted —dominate the historical? Or was it merely a skill employed subservient to a real historical aim?[3]

The importance of the speeches to this discussion of historical value is seen when one remembers: 1) that the speeches represent approximately one-fifth of the entire work,[4] and 2) that in most

---

[1]See F. C. Baur, *Tuebinger Zeitschrift fuer Theologie* (1838), pp. 142ff.; also, Baur's *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi* (1845), available in English translation.

[2]"Acts of the Apostles," *A Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. James Hastings), vol. I, p. 27.

[3]Modern scholarship tends to accept the former—that artistry dominates the historical, to some degree at least. For instance, in Pauline studies the methodological question must always be raised: what are the sources? For Paul there are basically two: the Pauline letters and Acts.

John Knox, in his *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (New York, 1950), all but rejects Acts as an authentic source for Paul. As he says, "A fact only suggested in the letters has a status which even the most unequivocal statement of Acts, if not otherwise supported, cannot confer" (p. 33). His distrust of Acts is based partly on the fact that he distrusts the order of materials in the narrative (p. 24 and pp. 74ff.), and partly on the fact that he holds the speeches of Paul in Acts to be "largely, if not entirely, the composition of the author" (p. 23).

One of the most recent of Pauline studies, J. Munck's *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Danish edition, 1954; English edition, 1959) takes a somewhat more positive view toward the reliability of Acts, although he accepts the view of Knox basically. He writes, "Acts as a secondary source contains a quantity of material that is valuable as a primary source, although this has been revised and cannot in its present form be used as a primary source" (pp. 79, 80).

[4]See H. Cadbury for a detailed listing of the speeches, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 5 (London, 1933), pp. 403, 404.

instances the theology contained in the Acts is expressed in the speeches. The question is: who is ultimately responsible for this theology—the speakers on each occasion? or the author at a later date?

Background: Ancient Historiography

One of the most important of recent studies on the speeches in Acts is that of the late Heidelberg scholar, Martin Dibelius,[5] in which the speeches are studied against the background of ancient historiography. Dibelius shows that the ancient historian "was not aware of any obligation to reproduce only, or even preferably, the text of a speech which was actually made."[6] The classic example of literary freedom by a historian recording a speech is the case of the speech of Claudius concerning the conferring of the *ius honorum* upon the people of Gaul; the Roman historian Tacitus records this speech,[7] but it differs considerably from the text preserved in an inscription.[8] From his study of ancient historiography, Dibelius concludes concerning the speeches in Acts that Luke "follows the great tradition of historical writing in antiquity in that he freely fixes the occasion of the speech and fashions its contents himself."[9]

The work of Dibelius must be criticized by two methodological points. First, Dibelius centers his study of ancient historiography on the great Greek historian Thucydides (5th cent. B.C.) but the question must be raised: has Dibelius correctly understood the method of Thucydides? Thucydides is important to this study because he himself discussed his method of using speeches.

> As to the speeches that were made by different men, . . . it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy (*akribeian*) the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those who from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore, the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion (*ta deonta malist' eipein*), though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said (*xumpases gnomes ton alethos lechthenton*).[10]

Thucydides' concern for at least "the general sense of what was actually said" stands in contrast with the method of his near-contemporary, the historian Herodotus, who clearly composed speeches freely (he tells of things which happened long before his time, where Thucydides wrote about a contemporary war). But it is not

---

[5]"Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die antike Geschichtschreibung," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse* (1949); translated into English and included in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York, 1956).

[6]*Ibid.* (ET), pp. 139.

[7]*Annals* XI, 24.

[8]*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinae*, XIII, 1668.

[9]Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[10]I. 22. 1. Translation by C. F. Smith in the Loeb Library edition.

clear precisely what "the general sense" is supposed to mean. Dibelius, following the classical scholars Grosskinsky[11] and others, argues that *xumpasa gnome* refers not to the contents of actual, individual speeches, but to the general intention of the various speakers—what they could have said and what they might have said on certain occasions.

Opposed to this interpretation of the statement of Thucydides is the great English Thucydidean scholar, A. W. Gomme, for whom the speeches in Thucydides represent authentic summaries of actual speeches, as reliable as his sources of information were reliable. Gomme is aware—as is Dibelius—that rhetorical interests were highly valued by ancient Greek writers; even "historians" sacrificed history for artistry. But Thucydides does not fall into this category, for, indeed, Aristotle, Plutarch and others criticized Thucydides, not because he was un-historical but because his rhetorical style was not artistic enough.[12] In particular, Dionysius of Halicarnassus reproved Thucydides for being too *homoeides* (of the same style).[13] But it is precisely this point which, Gomme argues, proves the basic historical value of Thucydides.

> And he must rewrite in his own style. The actual words used it was impossible to recover; and had he attempted to write in the different styles of the several speakers (supposing him to have possessed this mimetic gift), that would have been to falsify the evidence; it would have been to pretend that a speech of Kleon's was reproducing his actual words, or nearly the actual words, when such a thing was impossible. Thucydides will make no such pretence; and his preface and summary to every speech are therefore *eleche toiade, toiauta men eipen,* not *tade* and *tauta.*[14]

To be sure, by writing the speeches in his own style, "to that extent he was substituting his own personality for that of the speaker";[15] but, Gomme urges, that "does not make them 'free compositions,' nor [does it] mean that when he said he was keeping as close as possible to the general sense of the actual speeches, he was saying nothing."[16] If Gomme is correct, then Dibelius cannot use Thucydides to prove that Luke "freely composed" the speeches in Acts. On the contrary, if Thucydides was in any way a model for the historian Luke, then we may expect the speeches of Acts also to express (at least) "the general sense of what was actually said."

But this leads to a second and more fundamental criticism of Dibelius, that is, that he is comparing Luke with the wrong people. This criticism has been stated with clarity and force by the Swedish

---

[11]August Grosskinsky, *Das Program des Thukydides* (Berlin, 1936).
[12]Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford, 1937), p. 160.
[13]*Letter to C. Pompeius,* 3. 20.
[14]Gomme, *op. cit.,* p. 166.
[15]Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1945), p. 141. [16]*Ibid.,* p. 148.

scholar, Bertil Gaertner in the first chapter of his dissertation on the Areopagus Speech.[17] Gaertner states: "When comparing Luke and the Classical historians, therefore, we must have before us the historiographical ideals that arose during the first year A.D. and not, as has hitherto been the practice, those of an earlier period."[18] In keeping with this methodological principle, Gaertner surveys ancient historiography, not only in the classical period (Thucydides, etc.), but also in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, showing what influences were active in the time in which Luke lived and wrote. In the Hellenistic period the tradition of Thucydides was carried on by Polybius (208-116 B.C.), who wrote:

> A historical author should not try to thrill his readers by such exaggerated pictures, nor should he, like a tragic poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences probably incidental to the occurrences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened and what really was said, however commonplace.[19]

On the other hand, Isocrates (436-338 B.C.) and his pupils represented another ideal, the ideal of rhetorical and literary artistry (a rather dominant ideal in the Hellenistic period). Thus in the age of Luke, two lines of influence can be seen in contemporary historians. Among the Greek historians, Diodorus (c. 40 B.C.) and Strabo (c. 64 B.C.-19 A.D.) generally follow the ideals of Polybius, while Dionysius of Halicarnassus (fl. c. 25 B.C.) shows strong rhetorical influence. On the Roman side Sallust (86-35 B.C.) represents (more or less) the tradition of Polybius, while Tacitus (55-117 A.D.), the greatest Roman historian of his time, was an artist.[20]

Gaertner not only corrects Dibelius by giving more attention to the later Greek and Roman historians, but he also makes up for a great deficiency by treating both the Old Testament and the Jewish traditions of historiography. Dibelius, like too many of the German Form Critics, has failed to see the importance of the Old Testament in understanding the New. Gaertner, in brief space, considers the Old Testament type of historical writing, as represented in what he calls the Deuteronomic historical books and in the Chronicler's work. In the former the speeches are not mere "flowers of rhetoric," but they

> occur at certain key points, and form an important part in the historical narrative. Their purpose is to summarize the events

---

[17]*The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XII). Uppsala, 1955. Translated by Carolyn Hannay King.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 17. Gaertner cites in particular: Dibelius, *loc. cit.*; Cadbury, *loc. cit.;* and P. Gardner, "The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909).

[19]II. 56. 10. Translated by W. R. Paton in the Loeb Library edition. See also II. 56. 11, 12.

[20]See Gaertner, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-17, where he also mentions Lucian, Arrian, Appian, Livy, Curtius Rufus, and Valerius Maximus.

of an earlier period, and thence draw conclusions for the future.[21]

In the latter the speeches "form a means by which he can make a sort of running commentary on the course of history, and propound the lessons it teaches.[22] Thus in both types, the speeches are functional, not artistic, and in both they are vital to the historical purpurpose (the "meaning" of the events recorded).

In the Jewish tradition of historiography Gaertner treats I Maccabees, II Maccabees and Josephus. I Maccabees is held to conform to the usage in the Chronicler's work. II Maccabees is held to be clearly independent of Hellenistic ideals, containing few freely invented speeches.[23] And Josephus is said to be "an exponent of Jewish historiography who does belong to the Greek tradition."[24] Although Josephus occasionally upholds an interest in historical truth (as in *Wars* 1:15), he does not follow his own counsel. The freedom which he exercises with regard to speeches is seen in his own divergent reports of the same speech of Herod in *Wars* 1:373ff. and in *Antiquities* 15:127ff. The unreliability of Josephus as a historian, due to obvious propagandist aims, is well established.[25]

Conclusion. When we consider the total background—OT, Jewish and Graeco-Roman historiography—we find no pre-determined answer to the question of how reliable was Luke as a historian. There was no clear-cut model that Luke was bound to have followed (as Dibelius intimates). There was present an ideal of rhetorical artistry, but not even all Greek historians followed that ideal in the composition of their speeches. The study of ancient historiography certainly illuminates the study of the historiographical methods of Luke, but it does not finally answer the question of how reliable he was.

Luke as a Historian

The reliability of the speeches in Acts must be determined ultimately by a discussion of Luke himself—his aims, his sources, his style, etc. Such a discussion, if it were to be carried on with due justice to the subject, would be beyond the bounds of this article; at this point we can only hope to point out the problems and make some suggestions.

1. A fundamental question, relative to the reliability of the speeches, is the question: who was the author of Acts? Traditionally, it has been held that Luke, the companion of Paul (Col. 4:14,

---

[21]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[22]*Idem.* Gaertner does not show a high regard for the historical value of the Chronicler's work, although recent OT scholarship is coming more and more to accept the historicity of many things in this part of the OT. See J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1959).

[23]Gaertner, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 23.

[25]On Josephus see H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (New York, 1929), pp. 41-45, etc. Also see F. J. Foakes Jackson, *Josephus and the Jews* (London, 1930), pp. 234f.

etc.), wrote both the Third Gospel and Acts.[26] The Tuebingen School broke with this interpretation, dating Acts late in the second century. Thus—it was maintained—the author was too far removed from the actual events, chronologically speaking, to have known what was said on any given occasion.[27] The Tuebingen dating of Acts has been drastically modified in most circles, but a date late in the first century[28] is still sufficiently late to make the same argument.

On the other hand, if the author of Acts was Luke, the companion of Paul, then there is no reason why the speeches recorded—especially those of Paul—could not be reliable accounts of actual speeches. If Luke was the author, and if the we-passages are meant to include the author, then he was present for Paul's farewell address before the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts 20:18-35).[29] Furthermore, these passages indicate that the author came to Jerusalem with Paul (Acts 21:17), and thus he could have been present at Paul's defense on the barrack's stairs (Acts 22:1, 3-21). He was probably nearby when Paul spoke before the Sanhedrin (Acts 23:1, 6), Felix (Acts 24:1-21) and Agrippa (Acts 26:2-23).[30] Furthermore, the author was present with Paul when he arrived in Rome (Acts 28:14), and presumably he heard Paul's address to the Jews in Rome (Acts 28:17-20, 25-28). As to the speeches of Paul in Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:16-41), Lystra (Acts 14:15-17) and Athens (Acts 17:22-31), the author could have received the account either from Paul himself, or from another companion who was present at the time.[31]

2. Another important consideration concerns the sources of Acts and their reliability. Whoever was the author of Acts, he claims to have used sources (Luke 1:2). If the author was Luke, then he

---

[26]It is generally agreed that these two books are the works of a common author. A dissenting opinion is held by A. C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 393-408.

[27]However, it should be remembered that even if Acts were written late, the author still could have used reliable sources (written or oral) from a much earlier time. A discussion of sources will be taken up briefly later.

[28]For instance, Dibelius dates it at 90 A.D., *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[29]The we-passages indicate that Luke was in Miletus just before the speech, Acts 20:15, and that he was with the party when it left Miletus, Acts 21:1.

[30]It was not improbable that some sort of court notes were made on one or more of these occasions. Papyri from Egypt have revealed that the Alexandrian Clubs circulated accounts of the trials of individuals before imperial authorities for various reasons. These accounts are generally held to be based on fact, composed "from the scraps of reports or from copies of the actual *commentarii*." H. A. Musurillo (ed.), *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford, 1954), p. 274.

[31]Could it be that Dionysius and Demaris are specifically named among the believers in Athens because Luke got his account from one or both of them (Acts 17:34)? At this time Paul was apparently alone, Silas and Timothy having been left in Beroea (Acts 17:14, 15).

must have had some source(s), written or oral, for the early chapters which deal with the church in Jerusalem. If the author was not Luke, then the author probably had sources for the activity of Paul, such as the "we-passages" source.[32] In the cases where the author used sources, then the speeches can be as reliable as the sources are reliable. And, the earlier the sources, the more reliable they are expected to be.

Scholars have long noted certain stylistic peculiarities in the early chapters of Acts, in those chapters dealing with the church in Jerusalem particularly. C. C. Torrey maintained that behind chapters 1-5 there was an Aramaic source,[33] and although Torrey's thesis has not been accepted in all its details,[34] there appears to be some substance to his argument. If the source was in Aramaic, then the date of the source must be early and close to the events when they happened—close to the first period of the church when the members spoke Aramaic. F. F. Bruce, in his excellent monograph on the speeches in Acts,[35] sees strong evidence for an Aramaic source behind not only Acts 1-5, but also behind 9:31-11:18 and possibly also parts of 12 and 15.[36] Bruce points out that Aramaism is not the same as Hebraisms, for the latter "can easily be put down to the influence of the Semitizing LXX Greek, but Aramaisms cannot be accounted for in this way."[37] Bruce especially points to a passage in Peter's speech on Solomon's Porch (Acts 3:16) and to a passage in Peter's speech before Cornelius (Acts 10:36ff.) where the Greek syntax is rather poor: "It is not Luke's best Greek, but it can be turned word for word into grammatical and intelligible Aramaic."[38]

The question may be raised: has Luke dealt with his sources reliably? Luke confesses that he uses sources, and in the Gospel he may be judged by comparison with the other Gospels where there is parallel material. F. C. Burkitt has compared Luke 21 and Mark 13, drawing the conclusion: "What concerns us here is not that Luke has changed so much, but that he has invented so little."[39]

---

[32]J. W. McGarvey recognized that the author used sources of some kind, and concerning written sources, he says that "this is not at all improbable." *Commentary*, p. xii.

[33]*The Composition and Date of Acts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1916).

[34]This material is divided into two sources by Adolph Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York, 1909), pp. 162ff., and by the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*.

[35]*The Speeches in the Acts* (London, 1942). This work has largely been ignored, perhaps due to the fact that at the time Bruce was more noted as a classical scholar than as a New Testament scholar (he now holds the chair at Manchester previously held by the late T. W. Manson). The pamphlet is out of print and rare; there is a copy in the library of Princeton Theological Seminary in Princeton, New Jersey.

[36]*Ibid.*, p. 8.

[37]*Ibid.*, p. 9, n. 1.

[38]*Ibid.*, p. 9.

[39]"The Use of Mark in the Gospel According to Luke," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 2, p. 115.

Burkitt goes on to assert that Luke should therefore be judged to be reliable in the use of his sources in Acts.[40]

3. The recognition of Aramaisms in the early chapters of Acts brings us to the question of the style of Luke, especially in the speeches. The great Harvard Luke-Acts scholar, Henry Cadbury, has argued for the Lukan authorship of all the speeches in Acts on the basis of common style: "the voice is the voice of Luke."[41] It had been argued that stylistic parallels between the speeches of Paul and the epistles of Paul prove that Paul is responsible for both (so also for Peter and James).[42] But Cadbury has effectively silenced this particular form of the argument by showing that there are as many or more parallels between the speeches of one apostle and the epistles of another![43] The coincidences of expression between the speeches and the epistles are explained by "not so much personal influence or identity of origin, but a common Christianity mediated by the historian and shared by others, or even commonplaces of vocabulary or expression more general than any religious boundary."[44]

Cadbury is correct in recognizing the common style of the speeches, but this need not cast doubt on the basic reliability of the speeches. Thucydides, who sought to give accurate accounts of the speeches, wrote the speeches in his own style, not trying to imitate the style of the individual speakers. It is only natural that Luke would leave the imprint of his style on the material which he collected in various ways.[45]

4. The similarities between the speeches of Peter and those of Paul are not merely stylistic: they extend also to the contents of the speeches and to the type of argument found within the speeches. Yet this need not lead to the conclusion that one man (namely the author) is responsible for all. C. H. Dodd, in his important Form Critical study of early preaching,[46] has shown that there existed in

---

[40]Dibelius has opined that Luke used different methods in the Gospel and in the Acts, respectively—*op. cit.*, p. 185; see also his essay, "Style Criticism of the Book of Acts" (1923), in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Gaertner replies: "On the other hand we would point out that it is the prologue which, in the principle, places the ministry of Jesus on a par with that of the apostles."—*op. cit.*, p. 28, n. 3.

[41]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, vol. 5, p. 407.

[42]See F. H. Chase, *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1902).

[43]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, vol. 5, pp. 414, 415.

[44]*Ibid.*, p. 415.

[45]McGarvey recognized the Lukan style of the speeches, and accounted for this partly by the fact that Luke translated some speeches originally delivered in Aramaic. *Op. cit.*, p. xiii. He concludes: "The speeches have precisely the characteristics which we should expect them to have if they originated and came to us as the narrative requires us to suppose." *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

[46]C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (London, 1936).

the earliest preaching a basic message, the *kerygma*, a pattern suggested by 1 Cor. 15:3ff. This message was the same, whether preached by Peter or Paul, whether preached in Jerusalem or Antioch in Pisidia. As Gaertner has said, "No wonder that the Acts' short reviews of the apostolic messages seemed alike. We should have been justifiably surprised had they been otherwise."[47] Bruce goes further by pointing out the primitive nature of the speeches in the first five chapters of Acts, as well as in Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch. Bruce comments on this latter speech:

> A late writer, composing freely, might have introduced more definitely Pauline theology into his speech. As it is, the one theological advance which it makes on the earlier speeches is the addition of justification to remission of sins.[48]

Gaertner has also noticed the "small shades of difference" between the primitive sermons of Peter and the later ones of Paul.

> Those by Peter contain expressions and ideas which have no counterpart in the Pauline section, e.g., *pais, archegos kai soter, archegos tes zoes,* which suggest a Christianity older than Paul's Epistles. The eschatological situation, as well as certain pronouncements concerning salvation, also belong to the same old theology.[49]

J. A. T. Robinson has even suggested that a passage in Acts 3 (especially verse 18) preserves "the most primitive Christianity of all."[50]

The basic similarity between the speeches of Peter and those of Paul does not demand that Luke freely composed them all. It is to be expected that the style shall be Lukan, and that it is to be expected that the contents shall be similar (since Peter and Paul preached the same gospel—1 Cor. 15:11).[51] With this in mind, the "small shades of differences" stand out as indicative of historical perspective. It is easier to suppose that these subtleties reflect reality than that the author was ingenious enough to invent them.

Conclusion

The question has been raised: are the speeches in Acts historically reliable? In other words, did the author freely compose them, or do they represent the general sense of what was actually said?[52]

---

[47]Gaertner, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 34.

[48]Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

[49]Gaertner, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[50]Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christianity of All," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 7 (1956) pp. 177-189.

[51]Cadbury argues further that the speeches betray a common interdependent exegesis of OT quotations, *op. cit.*, vol. 5, pp. 407ff. Bruce replies that this "can be accounted for by the primitive use of a recognized collection of *Testimonies,* messianic proof-texts from the O. T."—*op. cit.*, p. 13. Bruce relies heavily on the work of J. Rendell Harris, *Testimonies I-II* (Cambridge, 1916-1920). Bruce may be correct, but the conclusions of Rendell Harris have been seriously questioned. See a forthcoming article by Robert Kraft in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* on Testimonia material.

[52]The other possibility that they are *verbatim* records is out of the question, both because of their brevity and because of their general Lukan style.

The answer to this question must be given in this manner: First, the contention that they must be "free compositions of the author" is without foundation. Although many ancient historians freely composed speeches in the interest of artistry, others felt the compulsion to report as accurately as possible. The author of Acts could have followed either example, and his aim as expressed in the prologue[53] gives weight to the second possibility. The similarity of style and content of the several speeches does not necessarily require that the author freely composed them, and the small shades of difference give weight to the proposition that they do give the general sense of what was actually said. And the chronological distance that might have existed between the events and the author of Acts (if he is not Luke) does not necessarily make the speeches unreliable, if his sources were reliable. And there is good reason to believe that the author (Luke or someone else) had quite old sources which preserved the primitive preaching. All of this is to say that there is no necessity to consider the speeches are "free compositions of the author."

On the other hand, to prove (scientifically) that they are reliable is not possible.[54] The Biblical historian can only prove that they *can be* reliable, and if the historian is called upon to venture a judgment, he can only speak in favor of what is more probable.[55] Since there is no major obstacle to accepting them as reliable, and since the author expresses the aim to write an orderly account, based on "accurate" research, it is certainly the more probable choice to accept the speeches as reliable.[56]

---

[53]Luke 1:3—*edoxe kamoi parekalouthekoti anothen pasin akribos kathexes soi grapsai.*

[54]Note the discussion by G. Ernest Wright concerning the Patriarchs in his *The Book of the Acts of God* (Garden City, N. Y., 1957). History and archæology can prove that the patriarchal narrative in Genesis can be true, but they cannot prove specifically that the stories about Abraham, Joseph, etc., are, in fact, true.

[55]To the believer the speeches are self-authenticating. They are inspired, and faith that they are true becomes knowledge that they are true.

[56]To doubt what you cannot prove, in the tradition of Descartes, would leave history virtually void.

The Synagogue

Jack P. Lewis

I. Origins:

The origins of the synagogue, an institution of long standing in the N. T. period (Acts 15:21) are obscure. No undisputed reference is made to it as a separate institution in pre-Christian literature, though it is sometimes thought that Ps. 74:8 and 1 Enoch 46:8; 53:6 refer to it. Egyptian inscriptions from c. 221 B.C. would imply that there were already synagogues in that region at that early date.[1]

Efforts have been made to trace the origin of the synagogue back prior to Moses (*Gen. R.* 63 (39c));[2] to Moses (Philo, *Vita Mos:* ii. 214-215; Josephus, *c. Apion* ii.17); to gatherings during the Babylonian exile like those held in Ezekiel's home (Ezek. 8:1; 14:1; 20:1);[3] to assemblies convened by Ezra at the end of the exile (*Berachoth* 33a; *Pirke Aboth* 1.1); and to impetus given by Maccabean times. Some of these efforts are motivated by dogmatic considerations and each of them is less than convincing.

Sunagoge in the LXX renders nineteen Hebrew words, but most frequently stands for *qahal* and *'edah* which come from roots meaning "to assemble." Later Hebrew used *keneset* or *bet keneset*, also from a root meaning "to gather." Aramaic used *kenishta* from the same root. An alternate name for the institution is *proseuche*, "place of prayer."[4] Early Christian gatherings were at times designated *sunagoge*,[5] but in common usage, *sunagoge* designates a Jewish gathering or community while *ekklesia* designates a Christian one.

In the N. T. *sunagoge* designates a gathering (Acts 13:43; Jas. 2:2); a community (Acts 6:9; 9:2; Rev. 2:9; 3:9); and a building (Matt. 4:23; Luke 4:15, 16; 7:5). Evidence would point to there being a synagogue in every village of size in Palestine and in most of the cities of the diaspora. A scribe could only settle in such a city (*T.B. Sanhedrin* 17b). The N. T. specifically mentions synagogues in Damascus (Acts 9:2, 20); Salamis (Acts 13:5); Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:14; Iconium (Acts 14:1); Philippi (Acts 16:13); Thessalonica (Acts 17:1); Athens (Acts 17:17); Corinth (Acts 18:4, 7); Ephesus (Acts 18:19, 26); Nazareth (Luke 4:16); and Capernaum (Mark 1:21). An exceedingly long list of those men-

---

[1]See W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (Baltimore: Penguin Bk. Inc., 1951), p. 172.

[2]Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, II.740.

[3]G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I.283.

[4]Acts 16:13, 16; cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* iii.296; Philo, *Vita Mos.* ii.216; E. Schuerer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II.ii.69, note 85.

[5]Jas. 2:2; Heb. 10:25; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30:18; Hermas, *Mand.* 11:9, 13, 14; and the Marcionite inscription, see E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK., 1948), p. 4.

tioned in Jewish literature could be compiled.[6] Jerusalem is said to have had 394 (*T.B. Ket.* 105a) or 480 (*Jer. Meg.* 73d) synagogues by the year 70 A.D. One is said to have meetings within the temple count itself (*M. Yoma* 7.1; *Sota* 7.7-8; *T. Sukkah* 4.11). Other cities like Alexandria likewise had many synagogues (Philo, *Legat.* 20; *Flac.* 6).

II. The Purpose of the Synagogue:

Various national and social groups had their own synagogues. The Alexandrian Jews had a synagogue in Jerusalem (Acts 6:9; *T. Meg.* iii.6.224; *J. Meg.* 3.73d, 26). Essenes had synagogues (Philo, *Prob.* 81).[7] It has been thought that the synagogue of Theodotus is connected with that of the Freedmen.[8]

The synagogue prior to 70 A.D. existed alongside of the temple and was complementary rather than antagonistic to it. It was not a center of sacrifice, but a center of religious instruction and of worship largely led by laymen. While the school (*bet ha-midrash*) and the synagogue (*bet ha-keneset*) are to be carefully distinguished, the synagogue was unique in the ancient Mediterranean world in its effort to educate the entire people in its religion from the body of Sacred Scripture. The school touched the few; while the synagogue aimed at the adult masses. God had revealed instruction concerning all responsibilities of life. The future of an individual depended upon his conformity. He must know the Torah.

> For even now this practice is retained, and the Jews every seventh day occupy themselves with the philosophy of their fathers, dedicating the time to the acquiring of knowledge and the study of the truths of nature. For what are our places of prayer throughout the cities but schools of prudence and courage and temperance and justice and also of piety, holiness and every virtue by which duties to God and men are discerned and rightly performed?" (Philo, *Vita Mos.* ii.216).

Elsewhere Philo speaks of thousands of houses of instruction open each Sabbath day (Philo. *Spec.* ii.62). "To Teach" in the synagogue is a frequent N. T. description of its function (Matt. 4:23; Mark 1:21; Luke 4:15, 31; 6:6). Josephus likewise says:

> Every week men should desert their other occupations and assemble to listen to the Law and to obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of it (Josephus, *c. Apion* 175).

At the same time, a synagogue was also a place of prayer or worship as is indicated by one of its titles, *proseuche* (Josephus, *Vita* 54; *Ant.* 14.10.23). It was a worship without sacrifice and in which, after the year 70 A.D., prayer took the place of sacrifice in the minds of the worshippers.

The synagogue in the diaspora served as a mission center. Though Jews did not organize for missionary activity in the Christian sense, Gentiles did attend the synagogue, which probably appeared as schools of philosophy and some of them became proselytes. Those who became monotheists and observed Jewish ethics without under-

---

[6]Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, IV.1, 117-118.
[7]*Ibid.*, IV.1, 117. [8]W. F. Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

going circumcision, washing, and offering a sacrifice in the temple were still outside the community, but were known as "God fearers" (Acts 10:1).[9]

III. Buildings:

The building of the synagogue was looked upon with a certain sanctity so that rules were formulated for conduct within its area (*T. B. Meg.* 28 a-b) and for what purposes it could be sold (*M. Meg.* 3.2),[10] but it was not exclusively used for religious purposes. Josephus describes a community gathering for discussing matters of war that was held in a synagogue (Jos. *Vita* 276-277). In a strictly Jewish community, the synagogue served as a sort of civic center (*T. B. Ket.* 5a; *Baba Mezia* 28b).

The building might be erected by the community (*T. B.B.* i.6) or by a philanthropic individual such as the centurian (Luke 7:5; cf. *T. Meg.* iii.224.20), or Theodotus who has left behind the oldest known synagogue inscription.[11] Other evidence for non-Jewish participation in providing the furnishings of a synagogue is to be seen in *J. Meg.* 74a; *Arakhin* 6b. The synagogue building was the property of the community (*M. Nedarim* 5.5; *Meg.* 3.1).

Early synagogues in Palestine were likely destroyed by Titus or by Hadrian. Remains of a synagogue in Capernaum from the 3rd cent. have been excavated and partially restored. Its interior was 70 x 50 ft. Its walls were decorated with palm trees, vines, eagles, lions, and boys carrying garlands.[12] An inscription from the synagogue in Corinth was found in 1898, poorly cut with letters 2½-3½ inches high, reading "Synagogue of the Hebrews." The date is uncertain, but may be slightly later than the N. T. period.[13] One of the most colorful ancient synagogues is that of Dura Europas which was excavated in 1928. A private house had been enlarged into a place of worship c. 245 A.D. It was entered from the east. The room by 25 x 40 ft. Benches were along the walls. The walls were adorned with paintings depicting O. T. scenes: Abraham's sacrifice; Ezekiel's dry bones, Job's story, and others.[14]

The synagogue often had a *bema* or stand where the reading was carried on (*M. Sota* 7.8). There was a *teba* or ark where the scrolls were preserved when not being used (*M. Meg.* 3.1). Seats were provided for the worshippers (*J. Meg.* 73d. 61). It cannot be demonstrated that the separation of men from women goes back to N. T. times, but it is a custom of long standing. The Gospel speaks of "Moses' seat" and of "chief seats in the synagogues" (Matt. 23:2,

---

[9]H. J. Cadbury, *The Bk. of Acts in History* (NT.:Harper, 1955), p. 107, n. 14.

[10]Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, II.663.

[11]G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Phila., Westminster, 1957), p. 257.

[12]J. Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past* (Princeton: U. Press, 1959), pp. 304f.

[13]*Ibid.*, p. 361.

[14]*Ibid.*, pp. 496-498.

6). Special seats for the honored members of the congregation were provided. Elders had seats facing the people with their backs to the ark (*T. Meg.* 4.21; *Sukkah* 4.198.23; Philo, *Prob.* 81).[15]

IV. Organization:

The synagogue was an autonomous congregational institution under the general oversight of the elders of the place. In a predominantly Jewish community political and religious organizations were not separate. Ten men were required to be present for a service to be conducted (*M. Meg.* 4.3). Women attended zealously (*T. B. Aboda Zara* 38 a, b).

The ruler of the synagogue (*archisunagoge; rosh ha-keneset;* Mark 5:22, 35, 36, 38; *M. Sota* 7.7f) had the responsibility of exercising oversight and maintaining order. His authority did not extend to community affairs, but he had the duty of conducting public worship, determining who should read and who should preach (Luke 13:14; Acts 13:15; cf. Justin, *Dial.* 137). He might invite prominent strangers to address the congregation if he chose. In the N. T. *Chrispus* (Acts 18:8) and Sosthenes (Acts 18:17) are rulers of the synagogue. There are cases in which "ruler of the synagogue" was an honorific title.[16]

The minister (*Hazzan* or *huperetes;* Luke 4:20; *M. Sota* 7.7-8; *Yoma* 7.1) had the duty of preparing the building for the public service; of announcing the onset of sabbaths and festivals by blowing of a trumpet blast from the roof (*T. Sukkah* 4.11f; *Shabbat* 35b); of scourging condemned culprits (*Makkoth* 3.12); and even of reading in a small congregation. He presented the scroll to the reader and replaced it in the ark when the reading was completed (Luke 4:20; *Sopherim* 4.3; *M. Sota* 7.7-8). At times he may also have done duty as the teacher of children (*Sabbath* 1.3).

The collectors of alms (*gabba'e zedaqah; Demai* 3.1; *Kiddushin* 4.5) though more civil than religious officials made their collections in the synagogue (Matt. 6:2). It included both money and natural products (*Peah* 8.7; *Pesachim* 10.1).

The representative of the community (*sheliah zibbur*) pronounced the prayer at public worship (*M. Berakoth* 5.5; *Rosh ha-Shana* 4.9), but he need not be a permanently appointed official. Any adult member of the congregation could serve.

VI. The Synagogue Service:

The worship of the synagogue included the following activities:

The reciting of the *Shema.* The Shema is a confession of faith composed of two introductory and one closing benedictions separated by the recitation of Deut. 6:4-9 whose opening word is *shema;* Deut. 11:13-21; and Num. 15:37-41 (*M. Berakoth* 1, 2).

Prayer: The prayer known as the 18 benedictions (*Shemone 'esre*) is thought to go back to the first century A.D. Jews were urged to pray in the synagogue (*T. B. Berakoth* 8a). One person

[15]Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.,* I.909. [16]J. Juster, *Les Juifs,* I.453.

led in prayer (*M. Berakoth* 5.5). The people responded by answering "amen" (*Berakoth* 8.8; *Taanith* 2.5).

The Reading of the Torah (Acts 13:15, 27; 15:21; 2 Cor. 3:16; Josephus *c. Apion* 2.17-18): The reader stood while reading (Luke 4:16; *M. Sota* 7.7). The Law was ordinarily read in Hebrew and then translated into the vernacular. Fixed rules determined that only one verse should be read before the reader paused for translation (*Meg.* 4.4; 6.10). The translator could not read his translation from previously prepared materials (*Jer. Meg.* 74d), but eventually translations (Targums) into Aramaic came to be written down. At times in the diaspora the LXX was used for reading. Fixed blessings introduced and closed scripture reading. By the third cent. A.D. the reading was continuous so that from one to three years were required to read the whole. A fixed hierarchy of priest, levite, and Israelite was followed in determining who would be invited to read; and a number of readers might participate on a given day. From an early time the reading may have been rhythmical or chanted (*T. B. Meg.* 32a).

Reading from the Prophets (Luke 4:16f.; *Meg.* 4.4-5): The prophetic reading (*Haftorah*) followed that of the law. In early times the choice of the prophetic section to be read was left to the reader's discretion, but eventually, each Torah portion (*parasha*) had its *haftorah*. Any person might read the portion from the prophets (*Gittin* 59b).

The Sermon: The synagogue had no fixed rules concerning who would preach. There was no established, paid ministry. Ordination was not required. Any competent individual might be invited, especially distinguished visitors. One sat to preach (Luke 4:20). The homily would ordinarily be built around the portion of scripture read. It was delivered in the vernacular.

Almsgiving: The collection of money also took place in the synagogue (Matt. 6:2; *T. Shab.* 16.22). The poor were sometimes fed (*Pesahim* 101a).

CONCLUSION:

The early preaching of the church was done in the synagogue. Here both Jesus and Paul found an audience. Early converts both Jew and Gentile had been trained in its teaching. The debt of the church to this institution is obvious. The organization and worship of the church has more affinity to that of the synagogue than to that of the temple.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Backer, W., "Synagogue," *Hastings Dict. of Bible*, IV.640ff.
Moore, G. F., *Judaism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946, I.281-307.
Juster, J., *Les Juifs Dans L'Empire Roman*. 2 Vols. Paris: Librarie Paul Genthner, 1914.

Schurer, E., *The Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885. II.ii.52-89.

Schwartzman, S. D., "How Well did the Synoptic Evangelists Know the Synagogue?" *HUCA.* XXIV (1953), 115-132.

Strack, H. L. und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Munchen: C. H. Beck, 1928, IV.i. 115-188.

Sukenik, E. L., *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece.* London: Humphrey Mildord, 1934.

Roman Citizenship and its Bearing on The Book of Acts

Eugene Brewer

In one of his recent books Dr. Henry J. Cadbury makes this statement:[1]

> Perhaps the largest number of Roman questions in Acts centre in various ways about the matter of Roman citizenship. That topic will at least make a convenient starting point for considering further the Roman background of the book. It is also a subject on which no comprehensive study exists by Roman historians, though an excellent beginning has been made in two books, one by a former student of mine in her doctoral thesis, and one by an Oxford scholar . . .[2]

As this quotation indicates books of a religious nature contain little information on this subject. Even the well-known work of Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, perhaps the best works on the historical setting of Acts had the latter part of its title added "rather out of *pietas* than as appropriate to the contents."[3]

This paper makes no pretense at being a comprehensive study of its subject, of course; it is only hoped that it will clarify Paul's relationship to the imperial government for the student of Acts.

The Development of the Roman Citizenship

The Earliest Beginnings. The earliest divisions among the people of Rome are into three groups. First, there were the Patricians. They probably were originally "free born" men (*ingenuii*)[4] the men who could point to fathers who were free and in their turn became full heads of families. In short, these were the men who, at a time when the family with its juristic head, and not the mere individual, was the true unit of life, the only full citizens of Rome. The Pa-

---

[1]*The Book of Acts in History* (London, Adams and Charles Black, 1955), p. 65.

[2]These two works according to a footnote on p. 83 are Charlotte E. Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship, A Study of its Territorial and Numerical Expansion from the Earliest Times to the Death of Augustus*, 1935 and A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939). Cadbury makes mention of an extensive literature on the subject, but says that he will make mention only of the review of the latter book by A. Momigliano in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, 31 (1941), pp. 158-165. Reference may be had to the Article "Civitas" in the reference set, *Real-Encyclopaedie der clasoishen Altertumswissenschaft* (neue Bearbortung, Herausgegeben von Georg Wissowa, Sapplemeur, Estes Heft, 1903), pp. 299-317 by E. Kornemann.

[3]Cadbury, *Op. Cit.*, p. 65. Ramsey's book is most helpful in giving details of the procedure for the citizen's appeal to the Emperor.

[4]Compare Acts 22:28. Cadbury thinks the word in the original suggests the Latin *ingenuus*, "the technical term for a birthright citizen." *Ibid.*, p. 68.

tricians in these early times could be partners in the true ownership of property, and they could sue and be sued. They also had the duty of taking the field on horseback or in heavy armor. Second, there were the Plebeians, including the whole free community other than the Patricians. They were the complement of the Patricians—the multitude compared to the privileged class. The third division were called Clients. These were the slaves or bondservants, and they were very numerous.[5]

Only the Patricians were full citizens in every particular, though those Plebeians who were not entirely dependent on a *patronus* for their legal rights also exercised limited civil privileges. Between these full and partial citizens a considerable difference existed. The *civis* signified less definitely than *quirites* the possession of active political rights. Hence is explained the application to women and to the partially-privileged members of the state—to those who were at certain periods of Roman history given rights in private law, while debarred from the exercise of the suffrage or the attainment of office. Only the Patricians could be called properly *quirites*.

It is possible that the distinction between the full citizen (*civis optimo jure*) and the partial citizen (*civis non optimo jure*), although probably not a primitive, may yet be an ancient conception of Roman law. Plebeians who were not entire dependent on a *patronus* for legal rights belonged to the latter class as was pointed out. Before the legal reforms of Servius, which gave them political privileges, they might have been called *cives*; it is only after this reform that they could have been called *quirites* as the designation of the full citizens with reference to all their rights.[6]

> If we ask what the original rights of the citizens of Rome were, it is impossible to frame a simple category applicable to all the *cives*. Taking our stand at a period just before the Servian reforms, we find that private rights were possessed in varying degrees by all the members of the community. These rights are generally summed up as those of trade and of marriage (*commercii et conubii*). The first is the legal capacity to acquire full rights in every kind of property, to effect its acquisition, and to transfer it by the most binding forms, and to defend the acquired right in one's own person by Roman process of law (*legis actio*). This *commercium* was possessed equally by the Patricians and the free Plebeians . . . The *jus conubii* is the right to conclude a marriage which is regarded as fully valid by the state . . . and which, therefore, gives rise to the *patria potestas*. This right was possessed by the Patricians and by at least the free Plebeians, but by each class only within itself.[7]

Public rights such as those of voting, of serving as a fully-equipped soldier in the legions, and probably of holding office as a delegate of the king—were possessed exclusively by the Patricians; and to

---

[5]A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life* (London, Macmillan, 1922), pp. 4f.

[6]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, pp. 34, 35.

[7]*Ibid.*, pp. 35, 36.

these privileges must be added the right of holding the fullest communion with the gods.

The normal mode of acquisition of citizenship was naturally birth, either from two citizens or from a citizen and a foreigner. Where *conubium* existed between the father and the mother, the children followed the status of the father. Where *conubium* did not exist, they followed the mother.[8]

The right of the people to final jurisdiction in cases involving the life or civil status of citizens was established by an enactment (*lex Valeria*), which is said to have been proposed by one of the first consuls (509 B.C.), and which granted the right of appeal to the assembly (*provocatio*) against the execution of a capital or other serious penalty pronounced by a magistrate. This right of appeal was reinforced or extended by subsequent enactments (*leges Valeriae*) in 449 and 299 B.C.[9]

Under the Republic. The spread of citizenship gained its impetus during the period of the Roman republic. Under it the regular legions had always consisted of Roman citizens. That meant Italians, but in the Civil Wars, with the unusual demand for recruits, provincials were enrolled, and in order to continue the requirement they were given citizenship by the general upon their entry into service. Antony must have thus granted citizenship to thousands in the Eastern provinces before his defeat at Actium. The emperors followed the same policy. The auxiliary forces of the army were, except for their officers, not Roman citizens, but upon their discharge, they, too, were given the franchise.[10]

The domain of the Roman power also grew greatly under the Republic. With this growth came the need for provincial organization. The practice arose of appointing governors or procurators over the provinces to keep them under subjection to Rome, to collect taxes, and administer justice wherever Roman law was concerned. Violators of local laws were tried by local courts. In case the defendant was a Roman citizen he might appeal to the imperial court at Rome.[11]

By the date of the *lex Hortensia* (287 B.C.) the Republican constitution had, in all essential points, completed its growth. The merging of Patricians and Plebeians into one community created the necessity for a universal conception of citizenship applicable to the whole body which possessed active political rights.[12]

Under Julius Caesar and the Triumvirate. The outstanding contribution to the spread of Roman citizenship by the period was the planting of colonies outside of Italy, a policy begun by Julius Caesar

---

[8]*Ibid.*, pp. 132, 133.

[9]George H. Allen, "Roman Law," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), IV, pp. 2612-2614.

[10]Henry Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

[11]H. E. Dana, *The New Testament World* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1937), p. 263.

[12]Greenidge, *loc. cit.*

and continued by his successors. The typical procedure followed was to take an existing community and reorganize it, by the settlement in it of Roman citizens and by giving to it a Roman form of government. But in time the local natives were also made Roman citizens. Such were Philippi and Corinth which were made colonies by Julius Caesar. Philippi was settled mostly by veterans of service in the Roman legions. Corinth was settled mostly by freedmen. Other colonies were established under the empire which are mentioned in the Bible, but they will be mentioned in a later section.[13] As has been noticed, during the civil wars the generals had enfranchised large numbers of aliens to gain greater support in the provinces. Caesar, for instance, gave Latin rights to the whole of Sicily and to many other communities. He did not hesitate to form legions entirely of *peregrini* whom he had raised automatically to the rank of citizens. Indeed, he conceived the Empire as a commonwealth of provinces standing on an equal footing with Italy, with all freemen everywhere bound by the same duties and enjoying the same rights.[14]

Under Augustus. Augustus, in some respects, was a throwback to the Republican days in regard to his franchise policy. He threw overboard the revolutionary program of Julius Caesar, for when he became ruler of Rome, Italy was still mistress of the Empire. When he rewrote the constitution he kept the Republican forms and also retained the fundamental distinction between master and vanquished, citizen and *peregrinus*. According to Suetonius, he was willing to exempt provincials from tribute, but unwilling to raise them to the rank of citizens. He stressed the cleavage between citizens and subjects and on his deathbed gave Tiberius the advice to maintain that division.

However, a closer examination shows that his plan had some elasticity. While he was not as prodigal as Caesar in granting the franchise, it is also true that he did not give it as sparingly as suggested by Suetonius. It was he who formulated the policy of bestowing the full citizenship upon communities or individuals whose culture was Latin and on a par with that of Italy. Colonies under Augustus that are mentioned in the Bible are Syracuse, Troas, Pisidian Antioch, and Lystra.[15] He maintained a separation in all cases in which the provincials had not become Latinized. But if they had assimilated Latin culture and given proofs of devotion to Rome, he gave them either the Latin or the Freeman franchise. This was a powerful stimulus to the provincials to Latinize themselves. "In brief Augustus' policy was not to maintain forever the political superiority of Italy over the provinces, but gradually to

[13]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
[14]Vincent M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940), pp. 133-143.
[15]Cadbury, *loc. cit.*

raise the provinces to the level, both cultural and political of Italy.[16]

Augustus opened the service of the legions to men from free cities. He made them all Roman citizens on entering the legionary service. The auxiliaries, taken from the less civilized and politically unorganized tribes, or from districts which enjoyed Latin rights but were not organized into communities, were given the franchise on leaving the services. Thus a veritable stream of new citizens flowed into the ranks from many sources: from the ranks of Latins individually franchised, from the magistracies of Latin *municipia,* from the elevation of Latin communities into communities of Roman citizens, from each enrollment in the legions and each discharge from the *auxilia*, from the manumission of slaves, and lastly by illegal means.

> It is impossible accurately to determine the volume of that stream. (illegal means) A conservative estimate runs from twelve to fifteen, or even from fifteen to twenty thousand men a year; whence the paradox that under the Emperor who was allegedly vowed to the maintenance of Italian supremacy, political equalization made its greatest strides.[17]

Under Claudius. Claudius tried to attach the provinces more closely to the Principate by making the Princeps the champion of the best traditions of the Republic. Scramuzza says that he thought of the Roman state as a conscious and continuous absorption of the subjugated elements by the Roman burgess body. He felt that that body had grown by admitting the Plebeians, next the Latins, then the Italians, and that now it was the turn of the provincials. It was his duty not to arrest that process at the Alps and the sea, but to let it go on to its logical end. But as every extension of the franchise had been stubbornly contested, so also was the "beyond the seas" measure of Claudius. Scramuzza denies that he was, as some charge, reckless with the franchise. He gave the franchise to many, not primarily because he was liberal, but because he was loyal to the ideas of the founder of the Principate. But he was merciless if the conditions required for obtaining the franchise had not been fulfilled. He harvested where Augustus had sown a half century earlier, for he saw that the fruit was ripe. He showed himself far more faithful to the Augustan ideal than the conservative Tiberius.[18]

Moreover, Claudius tried to keep down any suspicion that granting of citizenship was a source of revenue for the Princeps. Dio says he granted it indiscriminately and that Messalina and the freedmen made a scandalous traffic of the franchise. " 'They sold it so cheaply,' says Dio, 'that it came to be a common saying that a man could become a citizen by giving the right person some bit of broken glass'."[19] Scramuzza answers this accusation by saying that from the beginning of the Republic any ruler advocating extending the

---

[16]Scrammuza, *loc. cit.*
[17]*Ibid.*
[18]Scramuzza, *loc. cit.*
[19]*Ibid.*

franchise was accused of avarice and other unworthy motives. He concludes that there seems to have been no actual system of corruption in the franchising of people under Claudius.

Under the long reign of Tiberius there may have been as many as 100,000 new citizens from the army service alone, but they were discharged and became citizens under Claudius, so they took his name according to custom, thus accounting for the large number of *Claudii* throughout the empire. The following figures show the spread of Roman citizenship. Male citizens on census rolls at the close of the first Punic war (420 B.C.) were 260,000; in 134 B.C. there were 390,736; in 85 B.C., after the incorporation of the greater part of Italy, there were 963,000.[20] Under Augustus and Claudius the following figures are revealing.

Year	Population	Absolute Increase Since Last Census	Divided by	Average Increase Since Last Census
28 B.C.	4,063,000			
8 B.C.	4,233,000	170,000	20 years	8,500
14 A.D.	4,937,000	704,000	21 years	33,524
48 A.D.	5,984,072	1,047,072	34 years	30,796

Thus Scramuzza points out that there was a greater annual rate of increase under Augustus' so-called conservative policy than under Claudius' "reckless" policy, despite more citizens from whom natural births would issue.[21]

The method of Romanizing Italy was followed by Claudius throughout the empire. First, the imperial government conferred the Latin right upon deserving tribes and rural groups or communities without constituting them into *municipia.* Secondly, such civilized communities as had become Latinized by their own initiative were raised to the status of Latin *municipia.* Thirdly, if a Latin community had rendered some signal service to Rome, or had become the equal of a Roman community in culture and patriotism, it was given full citizen union with the status of a Roman *municipium.* Fourthly, the imperial government on its own initiative founded colonies including Ptolemais and Iconium, either with the status of Latin citizens or that of full Roman citizens.

After Claudius. With the grant of a local charter went the bestowal either of full Roman citizenship or the status of "Latinity" which was the half-way house to the *civitas.* This was discussed above. The privileged position of Italy was no interest of the Emperors, least of all of those who, like Trajan and his successors, came of families domiciled in provincial towns; and the Western world was rapidly Romanized. Vespasian granted the Latin right to all towns in Spain which did not yet possess it; and the comple-

[20]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
[21]Scramuzza, *loc. cit.*

mentary fragments of the two scores of charters issued in pursuance of his edict, which were discovered at Malaga, furnish some of the most valuable evidence available concerning local government. Only the magistrates and their nearest relations became citizens of Rome. It was then that this "greater Latinity" was bestowed on African towns, and the path was gradually made plain for the famous Edict of Caracalla.[22]

Edward Gibbon explained what the aforementioned edict was.

> Our constant attention to that great object will not suffer us to overlook a most important edict of Antonius Caracalla, which communicated to all the free inhabitants of the empire the name and privileges of Roman citizens. His unbounded liberality flowed not, however, from the sentiments of a generous mind; it was the sordid result of avarice . . .[23]

Allen observes that as Roman citizenship became more and more widely extended throughout the empire its relative value diminished, and it is obvious that many of the special privileges, such as the right of trial at Rome, must have been gradually lost. The emperors began to delegate their power of final jurisdiction to the provincial governors, and finally, after the Edict of Caracalla, the right of appeal to Rome remained the privilege of certain classes only—senators, decurions, officers of equestrian rank, etc.[24]

Thus the history of Roman citizenship has been outlined briefly. At first it was confined to a small minority within the city-state of Rome. Then it was broadened to include the Plebians of that city. It then spread through Italy, Europe, and even across the seas.

Ways of Obtaining Roman Citizenship

Free-born. As in all nations, the normal mode of acquiring citizenship was by birth. Greenidge notes that at the close of the Republic, citizens by manumission were *libertinus,* while all others were free-born, *ingenuii.* The distinction was an important one, since the latter was a requisite for the army, the magistracy, and the higher orders of the state.[25] The acquiring of citizenship by birth was from two Roman citizens united in *justae nuptiae.* There was no *conubium,* or right of Roman marriage (unless specially granted), except with a Roman woman. If the union were un-Roman or unlawful, it gave no *patria potestas,* and the children followed the mother's condition.[26]

Thus Paul claimed "free-born" status in Acts 22. Cadbury has some interesting information on how this was proved. Birth certificates of Roman citizens recently have been coming to light. In

---

[22]H. Stuart Jones, "Administration," *The Legacy of Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.), pp. 129, 130.

[23]Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (New York: Peter Fenelon Collier, 1899), p. 197.

[24]Allen, *loc. cit.*

[25]Greenidge, *op. cit.,* pp. 4f.

[26]H. M. Gwatkin, "Roman," *A Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), IV, pp. 292, 293.

Egypt they were waxed tablets in Latin, certified copies of records posted at Alexandria within 30 days after the child's birth. He says: "They were held by the citizen himself and were probably used as an indication of his age, his identity, his relationship, his legal heirship to the father's estate and his privileges of Roman citizenship."[27] Such certificates were only copies of official records. Presumably a complete roster at Rome and lately discovered records in provinces were kept. A set of decrees was discovered awarding citizenship to a naval captain of Octavian, Seleucus of Rhodes on the Syrian-Cilician border. It is a copy of a decree recorded on a stele at Rome, but it provides for copying in the public records at Rhesus, at Tarsus, and at Antioch.

Manumission of slaves. Any perfectly valid form of manumission conferred citizenship on slaves. The most usual form was the *manumission vindicta.* A man of straw appeared before any magistrate, who could claim the conduct of the *legis* action, declared the slave to be free and touched his head with a staff (*vindicta*). The master yielded, and this cession of his rights was followed by the declaration of the magistrate that the slave was free. A second form was the enrollment on the register of citizens by the censor, when the census was in progress, at the request of the master (*manumission censu*). It was the false declaration of the master that the man was free which gave validity to this form. A later third form was manumission by testament (*manumission testamento*), by which the master either commanded the freedom of the slave in his will, or left it as a trust to his heir. The inconvenience of these forms led to simpler modes—by announcement of the freedom before friends, or through a letter to the slave bidding him to live as a freeman, or even by inviting him to dine as a freeman at his master's table. Manumission effected in this informal way, though protected by the civil courts, did not confer the political rights of citizenship.[28]

For special service of merit. The gift of citizenship was, in the Republic, conferred exclusively by a decree of the people. They might confer the gift immediately or through intermediaries. The criminal laws sometimes gave a foreigner the gift of *civitas* as a reward for successful prosecution.[29] Claudius also rewarded service to Rome with the gift of citizenship. Enrollment in the fleet was made equivalent to service in the *auxilia*; citizenship was given to all free provincials serving therein 25 years. He offered it to all Latins who would, under certain conditions, engage in the importation of wheat.[30] As was noted earlier, a set of decrees actually has been discovered of the grant of citizenship upon signal service.

---

[27]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

[28]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, pp. 134f. Momiglians complains that one of the few weaknesses of Sherwin-White's book is his exclusion of the treatment of citizenship to freedmen. *Op. cit.* For the freedman's privileges, see Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

[29]Greenidge, *Ibid.* [30]Scramuzza, *op. cit.*, pp. 132f.

Cadbury says Antipater thus secured civic status for his house.[31] It was through this avenue that it came to be sold for gain.

It has been thought by many that this was the means by which Paul's family acquired citizenship. Though not dogmatic, Bruce says analogy would suggest that it was for valuable service rendered to a Roman general or administrator, perhaps to Pompey in 64 B.C. In a footnote he quotes W. M. Calder: "'Had not his father (or possibly grandfather) been made a citizen by Antony or Pompey? Were they not a form of *skecnopoioi*, able to be very useful to a fighting proconsul?'"[32] Some argue, on the basis of Jerome's statement, that Paul's family came from Gischala in Galilee and migrated to Tarsus at the time of the Roman conquest of Palestine. But such a view is rejected by Ramsay, who contends that his family was among the large group of 2000 Jewish families settled in Tarsus by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171 B.C. From 171 onwards there was in Tarsus a body of Jews—a privileged class in many ways. Ramsay says that in Tarsus a certain property qualification was required for citizenship.

> The citizens or burgesses of Tarsus, therefore, were a timocratic aristocracy, whose status rested on a property qualification, and who exercised the power of government and held the right of election and voting generally. Within this oligarchic body, again, there was an inner aristocracy consisting of the Roman citizens, viz., the families which had raised themselves so conspicuously in the city by wealth or by high office or, as was usually the case, by both, as to be admitted into the governing class of the Empire. In estimating the position of the young Paul, as he grew up in Tarsus, this privileged and aristocratic position which he inherited must be taken into account.[33]

So Ramsay concludes: "We must therefore regard St. Paul as sprung from one of the families which got the Tarsian citizenship in 171 B.C. . . ."[34] As to how Paul could hold dual citizenship, Cadbury says such was recognized by Rome. Augustus recognized the double citizenship and the double responsibility. Thus in A.D. 55 when Paul says in one context "I am a Roman" and in another "I am a Jew of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city," this dual principle is seen.[35] Lenski agrees that Paul's family probably obtained Roman citizenship by purchase or by grant for some special service to the state, although there is no way of knowing.[36] Others disagree,

---

[31]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

[32]F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), p. 446.

[33]Sir William Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul* (Reprint: Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1949), p. 227.

[34]*Ibid.*, p. 180.

[35]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 81. Sherwin-White (*op. cit.*, p. v) states that the object of his book is to show the idea of the dual citizenship, the *communio patria* was gradually discovered and applied to the overseas provinces.

[36]R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Columbus, Ohio, Wartburg Press, 1944), p. 688.

for Cadbury points out that it is usually supposed that Paul's family received its Roman citizenship through the Jewish slaves taken captive in Palestine by Pompey in 63 B.C. and deported to Tarsus and there freed.[37] While it cannot be certainly determined, it does seem it must have been by one of the two foregoing methods—likely the former.

To soldiers on discharge. Greenidge says that after the fall of the Republic the enlistment of legionnaires from the provinces was one of the most fertile sources from which the citizen body was recruited. In the last century of the Republic the custom grew up of permitting by special enactment such powers to generals in the field of conferring citizenship. This was the stepping-stone to the right possessed by the sole commander-in-chief, the Princeps to confer the citizenship at his pleasure.[38]

In connection with this mode of franchisement was the settlement of communities with Roman citizens, frequently veteran soldiers, known as colonies. These were established usually at the site of some city already in existence. To these cities belonged a small tract of the surrounding country. These colonies were practically duplicates of imperial Rome.[39] And closely related to colonies was the special grant of certain privileges, even citizenship, to whole communities, as was done by Julius Caesar. Sometimes these privileges consisted of independent administration of their local government. This privilege was granted by Rome either in recognition of some distinguished service which they had rendered to the Empire, or because of their civil status when conquered. These were known as "free cities." Such was Thessalonica.[40]

Requirements under Claudius. Claudius regarded citizenship as a constitutional prerogative of the Italian nation. By special act it was granted to such non-Italian communities or individuals as rose to the cultural level of Italians. The use of the Latin language was the tangible evidence of this cultural rise. Scramuzza notes:

> Enfranchisement without the fulfillment of this condition he regarded as fraudulent. For centuries men had found illegal ways of having their names inscribed on the citizen lists. These illegal practices continued under Claudius and indeed long after him. Tacitus, Seutonius, and Dio are in accord when they state that much corruption was rampant in this regard in Claudius' chancery. It was impossible for Claudius, as for the head of any state, to check up each violation of the law.

---

[37]Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
[38]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
[39]Dana, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
[40]*Ibid.*, and of course, Philippi (Acts 16:12). Cf. R. B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, Methuen, 1947, 13th Ed), pp. lvi ff; 280. Rackham says five cities named in Acts were colonies though only Philippi is so named. The others were Antioch of Pisidia, Troas, and Corinth. See also the article "Colonia" by Kornemann in Pauly-Wissowa.

> But whenever an irregularity came to his notice, he ordered that the law be fulfilled to the letter.[41]

He deprived some of their citizenship because they could not speak Latin. In fact, his test was severe, that a citizen must be able to plead his own suit without the assistance of an attorney. In some cases he punished those who obtained citizenship illegally. Scramuzza says that very likely some of the corruption charged to him dates from the preceding administration of Gaius, who, inclining to the political scheme of Caesar, tampered with the rules governing the franchise.

The second principle of Claudius' franchise policy was that citizenship should be granted only to those who had the proper moral qualifications. Augustus had sought to revive reverence for the gods and purity of morals, and Claudius followed him in this, disfranchising several citizens because they did not measure up to the moral standard befitting a good citizen.

Thus it can be seen that there were several different means of granting citizenship, some being more significant at one period and others at other periods. All in all the policy was one of expansion throughout the growing domain of Rome. It reached its climax with the Edict of Caracalla in 212 A.D. which granted citizenship to virtually all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire.

Advantages of Citizenship

Political privileges. Citizens had the privileges of voting, although it is unlikely that any would go from the distant provinces to do so. This was also a requirement for holding the political office. It was a principle of Roman law that no Roman citizen could be a full member of another state, although as seen earlier, dual citizenship was eventually accepted by Rome under Augustus. However, there was a second class of citizen with right of suffrage (*sine suffragio*). Probably the idea of this status was derived from Rome's relations with the cities of the Latin league, but in her process of absorption she conferred it on towns to which she did not grant the other typically Latin rights. These were known as *civis sine suffragio* or *municeps*, and the state, all of whose full members enjoyed this status, derived from its occupants the name *municipium*.[42]

Freedom from degrading forms of punishment. Bruce says that by the Valerian and Percian laws, passed at various times between 509 B.C. (the traditional date of the founding of the Roman Republic) and 195 B.C., Roman citizens were exempted from degrading

---

[41]Scramuzza, *loc. cit.* Cf. Cadbury, *op. cit.*, p. 68. Cadbury also refers to an article on the language requirement by C. S. Walton, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 19, 1929, pp. 40f.

[42]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-304. On the origin of *municeps* see Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*, pp. 38ff. The citizenship was conditional on the performing of some *manus*, lit. "hand," i.e., valor or service as a citizen. Campania was the first region to be so honored.

forms of punishment and had certain valued rights established for them in relation to the law. A Roman citizen claimed his legal rights by the statement *ciuis Romanus sum*—"I am a Roman citizen."[43] "'How often,' says Cicero, 'has this exclamation, I am a Roman citizen, brought aid and safety even among barbarians in the remotest parts of the earth!'"[44]

Gwatkin points out that no citizen could be scourged in New Testament times or put to death by any provincial authority without the right of appeal to the emperor.[45] Lenski quotes Cicero as saying: "To fetter a Roman citizen was a crime, to scourge him a scandal, to slay him—patricide."[46] Claudius Lysias intended to scourge Paul to find the cause of the uproar in Acts 22, but when Paul revealed his Roman citizenship to him he changed his mind. While Paul and Silas were beaten illegally in Philippi, it is not likely that they underwent "scourging," a most diabolical form of torture. Bruce gives further information on this practice.

> The scourge (Latin *flagellum*) was a fearful instrument of torture, consisting of leather thongs, weighted with rough pieces of metal or bone, and attached to a stout wooden handle. If a man did not actually die under the scourge (which frequently happened), he would certainly be crippled for life. . . . Fortunately, it was a penalty from which Roman citizens were legally exempt. In earlier days this exemption was total, and although under the Empire it was sometimes inflicted on citizens after conviction, they were still exempt from it as a "third degree" method of inquiry before trial.[47]

In regard to the proceedings at Philippi, Bruce says that citizens who had been convicted of no crime could not be expelled from a Roman city, thus explaining why the magistrates came and apologized and asked Paul and Silas to leave Philippi. A footnote in Bruce gives the elaboration of the Western text of Acts 16:39: "And having arrived with many friends at the prison they besought them to go out, saying, We did not know the truth about you, that you were righteous men. And having led them out they besought them, saying, Depart from this city lest perchance they come together to us again, crying out against you."[48]

Citizens could be imprisoned legally in three different ways: 1) *Custodia libera,* guest of some citizen who would answer for his appearance, used only in the cases of men of high rank; 2) *Custodia militaria,* in which one end of a light chain was constantly fastened to the prisoner's right wrist and the other end to the left wrist of a soldier (as with Paul); 3) *Custodia publica,* the common jail or dungeon (as with Paul in Philippi).[49]

Right of appeal to Rome. A. T. Robertson quotes Lightfoot: "'To

---

[43]Bruce, *op. cit.,* pp. 340f.
[44]W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1892), p. 239.
[45]Gwatkin, *op. cit.,* pp. 292, 293.
[46]Lenski, *op. cit.,* p. 637. [47]Bruce, *op. cit.,* p. 339.
[48]Bruce, *loc. cit.* [49]Gwatkin, *loc. cit.*

the Roman his citizenship was his passport in distant lands, his talisman in seasons of difficulties and danger. It shielded him alike from the caprice of municipal law and the injustice of local magistrates'."[50] In the province of Rome, the supreme criminial jurisdiction (both under the Republic and the Empire) was exercised by the Governors, whether they were Procurators, Proconsuls or Propraetors. To this jurisdiction the *provincials* were subject without appeal and it was often exercised in the most arbitrary manner. But the *Roman citizens* in the provinces, though liable to be brought before the Governor, were protected from the abuse of his authority by the right of appeal to the Tribunes. Under the Imperial regime, the Emperor stood in the place of the Tribunes; Augustus and his successors being invested with the Tribunician power, as the most important of the many Republican offices which were concentrated in their persons. The Imperial tribunal was erected into a supreme court of appeal from all inferior courts, in Rome or in the provinces.[51]

Bruce says the right of appeal to the emperor took the place of the earlier right of the sovereign people of Rome, which Roman citizens had enjoyed from time immemorial. It was usually exercised by appealing the verdict of a lower court, but could be made at any state in the proceedings.

> When the younger Pliny was confronted by the alarming spread of Christianity in Bithynia in A.D. 112, he took summary action against ordinary provincials convicted as Christians, but those who were Roman citizens he sent to Rome for appropriate examination and sentence, not being quite sure of the legal procedure.[52]

Gwatkin notes that the right of appeal seems to continue neither the old *provocatio ad populum* (appeal to the people) nor the old *intercessio* of the tribunes. It seems rather to rest on the general authority of the emperor, under the *lex de imperio*, to do most anything he should consider *ex usu republicae*. The appeal was not granted quite as a matter of course, but once granted, it stopped the case. The governor could not even release the accused. His only duty was to draw up a statement of the case (as Festus asked Agrippa to help him to do) and send him to Caesar.[53]

Under the early empire, provincial governors were generally under obligation to grant the demand of Roman citizens for the privilege of trial at Rome, although there appear to have been some exceptions to this rule. Roman citizens who were sent to Rome might be brought either before the senate or emperor, but cognizance of these cases by

---

[50]A. T. Robertson, "Paul, the Apostle," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 2273. Cadbury's Excursus on the appeal is interesting. *Beginnings of Christianity* (Macmillan, 1933), vol. V, pp. 297-338.

[51]Conybeare and Howson, *op. cit.*, p. 616.

[52]Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 478.

[53]Gwatkin, *loc. cit.*

the imperial tribunal was more usual, and finally supplanted entirely that of the senate, the formula of appeal becoming proverbial: *cives Romanus sum, provoco ad Caesarem* (*kaisara epikaloumai*, Acts 25: 11).[54]

As a citizen, Paul ranked with the aristocracy in any provincial town. It is not surprising that the lictors and praetors in Philippi were alarmed over what would happen if their action were known in Rome. They had good reason to fear even for their authority in the colony; for the people of Philippi, "being Romans," might be expected to resent such a violation of the law.

Paul seized upon the Roman empire as a symbol of the kingdom of heaven—"Our citizenship is in heaven" (Phil. 3:20); "Ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellowcitizens with the saints" (Eph. 2:19). The influence of the Roman empire on Paul is considered great by Robertson, who said that Paul would show the Roman genius for organizing the churches established by him. Many of his churches would be in Roman colonies. He would address his most studied epistles to the church in Rome, and Rome would be the goal of his ministry for many years. He would show his conversance with Roman law, not merely in knowing how to take advantage of his rights as a citizen, but also in the use of legal terms like "adoption." As a Roman citizen, according to tradition, he was beheaded with the sword and not subjected to crucifixion, the traditional fate of Simon Peter.[55]

Responsibilities

Jones points out that the censors were obliged to keep a register of the citizens and their possessions, in order to determine their liability to taxation and military service.[56] A citizen could lose his citizenship by failure to speak the new language; there were taxes on Roman citizens alone, especially a 5% inheritance tax; theoretically citizens were subject to draft for military service, though Jews generally were exempted; and they were subject to religious and moral regulation. This helps to understand why the accusers of Paul and Silas in Philippi said: "These men . . . are Jews and are announcing customs which it is illegal for us to accept or to practise, seeing we are Romans."[57]

The second class of citizens, *civis sine suffragio*, was named the "taker up of burdens," which aptly expressed his subjection to the chief duties of Roman citizenship, such as service in the legions, forced labor in raising defenses, the payment of the war-tax, and his exclusion from the usually corresponding rights of suffrage and of office. These citizens were subject to the praetor's court.[58]

---

[54]Allen, *op. cit.*, pp. 2612-2614.
[55]Robertson, *loc. cit.*
[56]Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 98.
[57]Henry J. Cadbury, *op. cit.*, 79f.
[58]Greenidge, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-304.

Thus it is to be seen that the responsibilities of Roman citizenship were very similar to those of American citizenship today. They were obligated to keep the laws, pay taxes, serve in the military, *et cetera.* But the privileges far outweighed the burdens, and Paul's Roman citizenship was of great service to him in preaching the gospel of Christ.

The "Western" Text of Acts

Frank Pack

No problem in the textual criticism of the New Testament has been more perplexing or vexing than the problem of the text of Acts. Here more than in any other New Testament book the divergencies between text-types are evident. In the manuscript evidence for this book two major types of readings confront the student, each supported by ancient witnesses, but with differences between them so great that scholars have come to recognize that there must have been two recensions of the text of Acts circulating perhaps as early as the late second century. The Alexandrian or B-type (Hort's "Neutral") text is found in most of the modern critical editions of the book and is shown in the ancient uncials Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (Aleph), Alexandrinus (A) Ephraemi Rescriptus (C), 044 (Psi), as well as the minuscules 33 81 104 326 1175 1739 with close relations to P^{45} (Chester Beatty Papyrus including Acts), and is supported by the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac Peshitta. The "Western" or D-type text is so-called because its chief representative in Acts is the bi-lingual Codex Bezae (D) written probably in the fifth century somewhere in Western Europe. Certain papyri have shown the same type of text. P^{38} containing portions of Acts 18 and 19 shows relationships to D and the marginal readings of the Harklean Syriac version.[1] P^{48} containing portions of Acts 23 and P^{29} from the Oxyrhyncus collection, both third century documents, show the presence of D-type readings in Egypt before the date of the great uncials. In the versions the D-type text is found in the African Latin version of Codex Floriacensis (h) and in the quotations from the Latin fathers Tertullian, Cyprian, the Latin translation of Irenaeus and Augustine. In the East this text is best represented by the marginal readings in the Harklean Syriac and by quotations found in the commentary of Ephrem on Acts.[2] Thomas of Harkel revised the Philoxenian Syriac version of 508 while in the library of the Enaton near Alexandria, Egypt, about 616, bringing this version into line with the currently accepted Byzantine text, but he placed a number of variant readings in Acts in the margin of his work and incorporated a number of additions into the

[1]Silva New, "Michigan Papyrus Fragment 1571," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, Vol. V (Macmillan and Co., 1933), p. 265.

[2]This commentary exists in Armenian translation and was published by the Mechitarist Brethren in Vienna in 1921. The Mechitarists had also published a fragmentary Armenian catena on Acts based on Ephrem and Chrysostom exhibiting "Western" readings in 1821. Prof. F. C. Conybeare rendered the commentary into Latin and placed beside it an English translation of the catena in J. H. Ropes, *The Text of Acts, The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, Vol. III (London: Macmillan and Co., 1926), pp. 380-453.

body of the text on the basis of ancient Greek manuscripts available to him. It is of interest that these marginal readings are among the best "Western" witnesses to the text of Acts we have.

The term "Western" has long been recognized by textual scholars as a misnomer, for it is evident from the above information that this type of text was widely used throughout the ancient world in the second century and existed side by side in Egypt with the Alexandrian. Yet the term continues to be used perhaps because it has become established through long usage as the name of this type of text.

Much interest in the "Western" text has arisen since the time of Westcott and Hort. In the *Introduction* to the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament, Hort emphasized the unreliability of this type of text, while noticing that "it was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times."[3] Giving only brief attention to the reasons for their rejection of it, Hort found it particularly objectionable in Acts because it was longer than the B-type text. He gave great emphasis to the canon of textual criticism, "The shorter reading is to be preferred," and only where he found it omitting something found in B did he prefer the "Western" text—which was mainly in the Gospel of Luke (These were Hort's famous "Western non-interpolations").[4] Because of undue regard for Vaticanus (B), he left largely uninvestigated and unsolved the whole problem of the oldest and most widespread form of the text of Acts. The purpose of this paper is to survey the major theories that have arisen as attempts to explain the "Western" text since Westcott-Hort, with particular attention to the more recent attempts to solve the problem and the present assessment of the value of the "Western" text. J. H. Ropes sets forth the three major alternatives in its solution:

> Either the "Western" text represents substantially the original, from which the text of B Aleph A C 81 as a definite recension was derived, or *vice-versa* the "Western" is a rewriting of the original Old Uncial, or else they are both from the original writer, different stages of his own work. To suppose that the bulk of the variations proceed not from one but from many hands is a wholly unnecessary complication and multiplication of the hypotheses, and runs counter to the clear indications of unity furnished by style and method in each text.[5]

Blass' Theory

One solution of the problem was developed by Friedrich Blass, following an earlier lead given by Clericus, Bornemann, and Lagarde and supported by J. B. Lightfoot.[6] It is the last in Ropes' three

[3]F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in Greek* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1881), p. 120.

[4]Hort rejected the "Western" text in Acts not only because of its alleged multitude of interpolations, but also because of its supposed tendency to paraphrase. [5]J. H. Ropes, *op. cit.*, p. ccxxii.

[6]J. B. Lightfoot stated, ". . . the solution will suggest itself that the evangelist himself may have issued two separate editions." *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, 3rd edition (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1891).

alternatives stated above. Blass held that Luke had published two editions of Acts, an earlier "rough" draft of the book which had been handed down to the Roman church and became the ancestor of the "Western" text (Blass' *a* text), while a later, polished form was sent to Theophilus and became the ancestor of the Alexandrian (Blass' *b text*). Blass advocated this view with much persuasiveness[7] and drew the support of such scholars as Theodor Zahn, Sir William Ramsay, Eberhard Nestle, George Salmon, and J. M. Wilson. Zahn adopted this view as the basis for his great work on the text of Acts entitled, *Die Urausgabe der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas.*[8] While Blass set forth his theory to explain the text of Acts, he found it more difficult to account for the text of Luke in this fashion. He tried to overcome the problem of the text of Luke by reversing his theory in the gospel and saying that the "rough" draft in Luke was the Alexandrian text and the corrected and shorter text was the "Western" text here. He held in each case that the more recent copy was the abridged one. As the work became more tedious and lost some of its original freshness, Luke began leaving out seemingly unnecessary details and thus we have the shorter "Western" text in the gospel against the longer "Western" text in Acts.

Although Westcott-Hort was published in 1881, several years before Blass advocated his theory, Hort in his *Introduction* specifically mentions the documentary possibility of such a theory, and many other scholars have followed him in this. It is a known fact that there were works published in antiquity in two different editions. Yet Hort rejected this theory on the grounds of internal evidence.[9] It is upon this same basis that Ropes discounts the same theory.[10] In some of the passages where divergencies of text appear there are differences of meaning that make it very difficult to see both texts from the same hand. It is hard to account for omissions of certain information in a later revised edition if both are from the hand of the same author. Another weakness of this theory is that it fails to account for the "Western" text in the other books of the New Testament. Even in dealing with Luke-Acts Blass had to invert his theory in passing from one to the other to explain the textual phenomena.

J. Rendel Harris followed Sir William Ramsay in recognizing some

---

[7]Blass embodied his theory for Acts in *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucas ad Theophilum, liber alter: editio philologica* (1895), and in *Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam* (1896). His *Philology of the Gospels* (1898) made available his ideas to English readers.

[8]When the first edition of Kenyon's *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* was published (1901) the theory of Blass had captured widespread attention, but by the time of the second edition of the *Handbook* eleven years later, its popularity had declined to a great degree (F. C. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1912), p. 342).

[9]Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 177. [10]Ropes, *op. cit.*, pp. ccxxviii-ccxxxi.

significance to Blass' theory and pointed out that there are some variants in the D-type text that undoubtedly appear original, evidencing great knowledge of geographical details in Asia Minor and the topography of the Holy Land. Also there are certain additions to the "we" sections of the book in the "Western" text that appear original.[11] However, he joined the majority of the British critics in rejecting the primary place of the "Western" text.

Theories on the Origin of the Corruption of the D-type Text

The next problem that confronted textual scholars was, if the text is secondary in character, what influences are responsible for its corruption, since it is quite early and its variations exhibit a homogeneous character? They busied themselves with first one theory and then another, in no case being able to arrive at any conclusion which would convince their colleagues of the correctness of their own particular theories. Harris called attention to the theory of Alfred Resch, set forth in *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien* and published as a part of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1892, edited by Adolph Harnack, which was largely a restatement of K. A. Credner's theory. Resch held that the earliest form of the text arose among the Ebionites and was "due to independent translations from a Semitic document (probably Hebrew) with the text being freely handled and interpolated with numerous glosses."[12] This theory Harris refuted ably.[13] F. H. Chase's view was set forth in his detailed study of Codex Bezae published in 1893,[14] in which he stated that the "Western" variations from the Alexandrian are due to the influence of the old Syriac translation. He traced the ancestry of D back to a Greek-Syriac bi-lingual manuscript produced in Antioch where Greek and Syrian influences met. Harris acknowledged the existence of a "Western" Syriac text and pointed out that there was one that had existed like the text of D which Ephrem used in his commentary on the Book of Acts, although at that time known only through the Armenian catena mentioned above, and in certain references in Ephrem's commentary on the Pauline Epistles.[15] But in spite of this acknowledgement it is impossible for the Syriac to explain the frequently recurring characteristics of D. Its variations exhibit a homogeneous character. J. H. Ropes observes

---

[11]J. Rendel Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text of the New Testament* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1894), pp. 64, 82. It should be noted here that Hort also recognized that there were some readings in the "Western" text due to the fact that the "Neutral" text had been interpolated, but this would not apply in Acts as it applied in Luke.

[12]Harris, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

[13]*Ibid.*, pp. 1-13.

[14]F. H. Chase, *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (Cambridge: University Press, 1893).

[15]Harris' view was later confirmed in the publication of such a commentary discovered in the library of the Mechitarists in Vienna in 1921.

> That the Greek text of Codex Bezae has been influenced from the Syriac has also been strongly urged, and some of the facts can be explained thereby, just as they can from the Latin, and in some instances ingenuity can point out with considerable plausibility that a possible confusion in the Syriac text would account for the variant in the Greek. But whereas influence from Latin is naturally indicated as likely to take place in a graeco-latin codex, the theory of Syriac influence has no such *prima facie* probability, and in order to be accepted requires telling instances of demonstrative force. . . . This proof, however, is not forthcoming, and the point is well taken that for some of the frequently occurring characteristics of D the Syriac offers no explanation whatever.[16]

A number of scholars through the years have tried to explain the differences in the text as due to Latinizing influences coming in through the bi-lingual texts. J. Rendel Harris held that nine-tenths of the variants in Acts were due to attempts to make the Greek conform to the Latin, since the Bezan Latin, he held, was older than the Bezan Greek, and thus the ancestor of the Greek. Von Soden also attempted this same explanation, but Ropes showed its inadequacy for explaining the larger and more important differences.[17] On the other hand Griesbach held that the Latin had been assimilated to the Greek text, and Scrivener maintained that this assimilation had gone so far as to deprive the Latin of any independent value.[18]

The conclusion of these investigations is that the "Western" text cannot be explained upon such a simple basis as these theories propose. Assimilations have taken place from all sides, if assimilation is the key to the problem of the "Western" text, and this type of study has resulted in no appreciable advance in understanding the textual situation.

Clark's Theory

A. C. Clark, a distinguished classical scholar, advanced the theory that the Western text originated in the Greek stage of the text.[19] Holding to the D-type as the primitive text in the Gospels and Acts, he drew his proof in his first book partially from certain parallels in the transmission of the Latin text of Cicero. Noting the frequency of homoioteleuton (scribal omissions due to the copyist's skipping of one or more lines due to similar words or endings or words) in the classical manuscripts, he posited that the primitive text of the Gospels was written with lines containing 10-12 letters with 16 lines to the column, and in the book of Acts short sense lines. Holding that the passages found in D but omitted by most or all

---

[16]Ropes, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxiv, lxxv.
[17]*Ibid.*, p. lxxx.
[18]Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
[19]A. C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914). See also, Clark *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) which contains a new critical edition of the text of Acts with critical apparatus and the most complete arguments for the originality of the "Western" text.

other Greek manuscripts of different text-type occupied either one or several stichoi, these accidental omissions could account for the differences between the two types. Thus he reversed the basic principle of Hort in relying on the shorter reading, and contended that the primitive text was longer, not shorter. The "Western" text has been accidentally mutilated to form the Alexandrian text.[20] While Clark substantiated his contention with numerous illustrations, Kenyon effectively answered his theory by showing first, that there are no proofs that indicate the length of lines of the manuscripts from which the New Testament was copied. Thus this basic element of his theory is entirely a matter of assumption. Second, within the fluctuations of ten to twelve, or nine to thirteen as Clark affirms, there can be almost every conceivable number of variations except in the very smallest numbers. This would destroy the significance of Clark's line length.[21]

In his second work Clark shifts his argument from accidental omissions as of primary importance (although he does give some space to mechanical omission of lines) and now views the omissions in B-type text as due to the work of an "abbreviator." He sets forth his arguments for the priority of D with great detail, and in many places in Acts he makes out a good case. Kenyon enumerates a number of passages, however, which are definitely suspect in the "Western" text, and he argues cogently that the text of Acts cannot be separated from that of the Gospels, where it is far more difficult to make out a good case for the "Western" text. While possessing some good readings, there are many that are suspect, and Kenyon has pointed this out clearly.[22] Clark did, however, call attention to the importance of the D-type text in a forceful way, and he has proved that it is not at all scientific to apply the rule without exception, "The shorter reading is preferred."

J. H. Ropes set forth in the most complete way the third major view toward the "Western" text in his monumental volume on *The Text of Acts*. Drawing upon the many investigations of scholars

---

[20]B. H. Streeter in *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1927), pp. 132, 133, held that Clark went a long way toward proving his case provided it included intentional omission of details thought unimportant.

[21]Frederic Kenyon, *The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts. Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXIV* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), pp. 19-24. Kenyon points out that Clark has made his judgments on the basis of medieval mss., while the earliest manuscripts are papyri, in codex form in which lines vary in number from 26 to 45 on the page, and the number of letters to the line from 16-30. Only one papyrus was known to Kenyon that had 10-13 letters in the line out of all the hundreds that he knew. Kenyon also calls attention to the fact that accidental omissions should produce nonsense in the text, but when the omissions are of sense materials and units, such a theory breaks down. If the lines in Acts were arranged in sense lengths, Kenyon asks why this should be in Acts alone and not in the Gospels. [22]*Ibid.*, pp. 25-31.

in various textual studies, he begins with the recognition that the D-type text is very early, and is to be thought of as a "real entity, which came into being at some definite time and place, was diffused from a single center . . . became mixed with other texts by various processes."[23] Pointing out that single readings and mere addition of results cannot be decisive in determining priority, he held that the Alexandrian type was on the whole original and the "Western" a recension.[24] He advances the idea, which he admits is not susceptible of proof, that the preparation of the "Western" text was incidental to forming the Christian canon that became the New Testament; in fact, he says, "the 'Western' text was the text of the primitive 'canon' . . . and was expressly created for that purpose."[25] He argues

> A careful reading of any approximate form of the "Western" text of Acts . . . will be likely to convince the student that on the whole, and apart from inevitable minor blemishes due to later hands, he has before him a definite integral text, not explicable as the mere accumulation of scribal errors and incidental modifications. That such a text would have been modified in divers ways in its early history is to be expected, and we can assume that it varied from copy to copy, as did the rival text, but the great mass of the variations which we can identify as belonging to it show unmistakable signs of proceeding from a single hand with his own characteristic method of work.[26]

Ropes' book is a veritable gold mine of evidence, containing not only discussions of the textual problems, but giving parallel reproductions of the text of B and D along with voluminous textual notes, detached notes, and specific discussions on special problems. Included is an essay by Prof. F. C. Conybeare, the distinguished authority in Armenian manuscript studies, discussing Ephrem's Commentary on Acts. Ropes concluded that there are two elements comprising the "Western" text: an ancient base, which we cannot recover, and the rewriting by a second-century Greek-speaking Christian, who knew something of Hebrew, perhaps in Syria or Palestine.[27] Ropes did not allow much originality to the "Western" text in Acts. In only four instances did he think it preserved the original text: in Acts 20:15 it inserted "and having remained at Trogyllium" (*kai mei-*

[23]Ropes, *op. cit.*, p. ccxxiii.
[24]*Ibid.*, p. ccxxiv.
[25]*Ibid.*, p. ix.
[26]*Ibid.*, pp. ccxxi, ccxxii. However, not all modern critics have admitted with Ropes' the homogeneity of the "Western" text. For instance, G. H. C. Macgregor in the *Interpreter's Bible* recently wrote, ". . . the 'Western' text as a whole is almost certainly secondary, and has probably resulted, except perhaps in the case of certain key passages such as the apostolic decrees, from a fortuitous accumulation of scribal alterations, paraphrases, and expansions, rather than from a systematic reduction of the entire Lukan text." G. H. C. Macgregor, "Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles," *Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 9 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 10.
[27]*Ibid.*, pp. ccxl-ccxliv.

nantes en Trogylia(*i*) before "the next day after we came to Troas." In Acts 21:1 "and Myra" (*kai Myra*) is inserted after Patara. In 27:5 "for fifteen days" (*di' hemeron dekapente*) is inserted after the expression "And when we had sailed across the sea which is off Cilicia and Pamphylia." He also recognized the omission in Acts 21:25 of things strangled" (*kai pnikton*) as probably original. Most scholars today would find Ropes' judgments concerning the Western text somewhat too conservative and tend to give greater weight to its readings than he was willing to give.

Ropes outlined the following characteristics of the "Western" text which marked its inferiority. First, he noticed its fulness of words, being the longer text. Second, he called attention to the elaboration of pious exeperssions, such as additions to the names of Jesus and the addition of conventional religious phrases. Third, the fact of the difference in language and narration arose through trying to explain superficial difficulties found in the "Old Uncial" text. Fourth, there is occasional misunderstanding of the meaning of the other text with some impossible "solutions." Cf. Acts 15:1, 5. Fifth, the relative colorlessness and empty naivete of the "Western" text in contrast to the vigor and occasional obscurity of the "Old Uncial" text. Even more decisive for him is the fact that with the additional material virtually nothing can be found that cannot be inferred from the other text.[28]

However, he did not notice any particular point of view, either theological or any other, that could be traced to the "Western" reviser. He finds one or two instances that seem to him to betray a Gentile feeling that any statement "is inadequate which implies that Christianity in the Apostolic age was limited to Jewry."[29] Also he notices a desire to make clear that the " 'sebomenoi' ('God-fearers') were converted from the status of heathen to the true God through Christ, not merely from Jewish faith to Christianity."[30] He rejects, however, any evidence of heretical tendencies in the "Western" text.

Development Since 1933

After 1933 (date of publication of Clark's edition of Acts) scholars tended to divide themselves into two major camps: the followers of Clark emphasizing the importance of the D-type text, and the followers of Ropes holding to the B-type text. A. F. J. Klijn has recently summarized the situation by saying,

> Ropes defended the Aleph B text which was, according to him, revised by a "rewriter," Clark took the opposite point of view supposing that text being revised by an "abbreviator." This could not be called a very satisfactory state of affairs as in this way the additions in D in comparison with Aleph B

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. ccxxiv, ccxxv. A number of these same characteristics had been noticed by writers like Sir William Ramsey, T. E. Page, *et al.*

[29] *Ibid.*, p. ccxxxiii.

[30] *Loc. cit.*

were overemphasized without preserving a great number of minor variant readings being present in other mss.[31]

In 1933 Sir Frederic Kenyon began publication of the remarkable Biblical manuscripts known as the Chester Beatty Papyri, which have changed some of the conceptions of the history of the text in Egypt. P^{45} of this group contained portions of thirty leaves from a codex originally consisting of about 220 leaves composing all the four Gospels and Acts. Portions of thirteen leaves from Acts are extant. Concerning this part of the manuscript Kenyon says, "In Acts it is distinctly nearer to the Neutral and has none of the major variants characteristic of the Western text in this book, though it has some of the minor ones."[32] However, R. V. G. Tasker in an article in the *Journal or hTeological Studies* characterized P^{45} in Acts as "a distinctive 'non-Western' text, probably older than the texts of the Great Uncials and of D, and presenting the same kind of characteristics as that known as the Caesarean text of the Gospels, and that possibly it is the text used by Origen."[33]

Thus he identifies it as probably the oldest representative of the "Caesarean" text for Acts. It may be that this more nearly represents the original text than the B-type text. However, P^{45} would certainly be nearer to the B-type than to the D-type in Acts.

C. S. C. Williams, while occupying the same general point of view as Ropes, criticizes him for not making "sufficient allowance for the tendencies that may be discerned in the material peculiar to the Western text of Acts."[34] He gives considerable notice to the classification of intentional variation of the great Roman Catholic Biblical scholar, M. J. Lagrange in his *Critique Textuelle*.[35] Lagrange pointed to the following *pietistic* tendences evident in the D-type text for Acts: (a) the figure of Christ is made clearer with titles of honor fully given, and other additions made, e.g., Acts 28:31, where the Western text concludes the narrative with the credal phrase, "that this is Jesus the Son of God through whom the whole world is about to be judged." (b) The work of the Holy Spirit is emphasized, a point that J. Randel Harris had already recognized. (c) The activity,

---

[31]A. F. J. Klijn, "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts 1949-1959, Part II," *Novum Testamentum*, III, 3, October, 1959, p. 169.

[32]Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1939) p. 126. He continues, "It therefore adds to the third century, a welter of various readings which were only gradually crystallizing into distinct families."

[33]R. V. G. Tasker, "The Nature of the Chester Beatty Papyrus in the Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVIII* (1937), pp. 383 ff.

[34]C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations in the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), p. 55.

[35]M. J. Lagrange, *Introduction a l'etude du Nouveau Testament:* Vol. II *Critique Textuelle* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1935), pp. 390 ff. This work was not available to the writer, but the summary of materials follows that given by Williams.

zeal, and piety of the apostles are stressed. (d) Peter is singled out for special emphasis in this text as to his authority, e.g., in Acts 8:24 Peter reduces Simon the Sorcerer to tears; in Acts 15:7 the text adds *en pneumati* which makes the speech of Peter at the council held in Jerusalem an inspired one; in 15:12 the "Western" reading is "and when the elders assented to what was said by Peter the whole gathering was silent." Williams here comments, "The Western reviser was not the last person in Church History to magnify the person of St. Peter at the expense of truth."[36] (e) The influence of Christian preaching and the Christian faith is noted by Lagrange. In Acts 5:38, 39 it reads "Leave these men alone and let them go without polluting your hands; for if this power be of human will, its force will be destroyed, but if this power be of the will of God, you cannot destroy it, neither you, nor kings, nor tyrants. Therefore refrain from these men, lest ye be found fighting against God." (f) It points out the hostility of the Jews toward the Christian faith and adopts a universalistic attitude.

Lagrange also pointed out a number of *explanatory* or harmonistic details. He classified some that are definitely out of keeping with Luke's style. He noted six readings that if omitted might deprive us of some reliable information, although upon careful examination there is not too much to be found here. But there were seven additions "that could very well be authentic." He included the three that Ropes had already mentioned and added 12:10, where Peter and the angel in leaving the prison "descended the seven steps." In 19:9 he recognized the addition, "in the hall of one Tyrannus, from the fifth hour till the tenth," or roughly from eleven a.m. to four p.m. He also placed in this list the reading in 19:28 "having run into the street" which he found as perhaps a "picturesque" statement indicated the extent of the riot. In 28:16 the "Western" text adds, "the centurion delivered the prisoners to the *stratopedarch*, but he allowed Paul to remain by himself outside the camp." To this list Williams adds several others that may be adduced although they are mainly very minor in character with the exception of Acts 15:20, 29, cf. 21:25. He does not find most of these additions compelling in character, although some may have merit.[37]

Lagrange also noted *omissions* in several places in D in comparison with the Alexandrian text, to which Williams adds three others, and he then concludes that in such a long text one would expect to find special value in its omissions, but they are "almost worthless."[38] Lagrange also recognized some *alterations* and *harmonizations*, particularly with the text of the LXX as well as a few *refinements*. It should be said that such a concept of alterations in the "Western"

---

[36]Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[37]He notes readings in 5:27b; 9:22; 10:40; 13:8; 17:26, 27, 28; 20:4 (here he accepts *Douberios* instead of *Derbaios*, a reading first pointed out by A. C. Clark); 21:21; 22:28; 24:6-8; 26:20.

[38]*Ibid.*, p. 77.

text as Lagrange and Williams find rests upon the presupposition of its being a later and inferior text. This writer has shown that careful alterations seem evident also in the work of Origen in the Alexandrian and Caesarean environment and had influences on the Alexandrian and later Byzantine text-types.[39]

Williams states at the conclusion of his study a view that is widely recognized among textual scholars today. "It appears that any future editor of the Book of Acts will have to be eclectic in his choice of readings."[40] With this same general conclusion Dibelius agrees in his essay on the text of Acts while supposing the D-type to be inferior.[41] However, the major point in his essay is that Luke's works were the only New Testament books written for literary use, and while Luke's gospel suffered less from such usage due to the more fixed literary form-type in the church and was used in public worship, the book of Acts was not in such liturgical usage and was more easily corrected through being "outside of the circle of the ecclesiastical reading-books, and within the circle of the literary reading public, exposed to its textual dangers."[42] Dibelius thinks that the original text has been entirely lost in a number of places because of its poor preservation. He concludes that conjectural emendations should be made extensively in the light of such a history of textual transmission.[43]

Klijn has pointed out however that Dibelius' conclusions will not be generally accepted because his starting point is not correct, and he cites the criticism of A. D. Nock that if it were true that Acts circulated outside Christian circles, it would not follow that it would receive rougher handling, for a good bookseller might have better scribes than the Church could command.[44] He also criticizes Dibelius' conclusions because the additions or abbreviations show a theological interest rather than a non-Christian interest, as Lagrange and Williams and others have recognized.

Klijn concludes his survey by saying that now both text-types are taken far more seriously than had earlier been the case with B still regarded as superior to D but neither one having the position of being the original text in all cases. He thinks that possibly in the study of the textual history in Egypt where Greek was the offi-

---

[39]See my article in *Restoration Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 139-146. The work of alteration was going on in both texts undoubtedly, a fact which needs to be recognized more than it has been formerly.

[40]*Ibid.*, p. 80. Also in his *Commentary* on the Acts of the Apostles (New York: Harper's, 1957) p. 49 he states, "It is now a commonplace of criticism that each variant has to be considered on its own merits; a textual type cannot be accepted *in toto*."

[41]M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956) p. 87 says, "Thus we must conclude that from the so-called Western text we may at best accept some individual readings which, on the basis of separate analysis and for specific reasons, prove superior. As a type the Western text has no claim to be considered as the original text."

[42]*Ibid.*, p. 90. [43]*Ibid.*, p. 92. [44]Klijn, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

cial language and a strong Christian tradition was built around such scholars as Clement and Origen that kept the text from being carelessly handled some of the problems of the text of the New Testament can be solved.[45]

Characteristic "Western" Readings

To show the reader the character of the "Western" readings in Acts, some of the more interesting ones are listed below: 1:2 "Until the day in which he instructed through the Holy Spirit his apostles whom he had chosen and commanded them to preach the gospel." 1:5 adds after "in the Holy Spirit" the words, "which you are about to receive not many days hence until Pentecost." 1:26, instead of "eleven" reads, "he was numbered among the twelve apostles." 2:19 omits "blood and fire and vapor of smoke." 2:37, "and they said unto Peter and the apostles, What shall we do, brethren, show us." 2:42 adds "in Jerusalem" to read, "and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching in Jerusalem, and in fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." 5:38, 39 has already been noticed earlier in the paper. 6:1 adds "because it was administered by the Hebrews" at the close of the verse. 6:3 adds, "What is it then, brethren, look out" etc. 6:10 adds "the Holy Spirit in which he spake because they were refuted by him with all boldness." 8:24 adds "who did not cease from much weeping." 8:39 after "and when they came up out of the water" reads "the Holy Spirit fell on the eunuch but an angel of the Lord seized Philip from him, and he went on his way rejoicing." 8:37 adds "and Philip said unto him, If you believe with all your heart, it is possible; and he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." (This is also found in the King James version.) 10:25 expands the passage to read, "And as Peter drew nigh to Caesarea one of the slaves ran on in advance and announced that he had arrived. And Cornelius leaped forth and went to meet him, and fell down at his feet and worshipped him." 11:2 is expanded in the "Western" text to read, "Then Peter after much time wished to go to Jerusalem, and calling the brethren to him and establishing them, he departed engaging in much preaching throughout the regions and teaching them; who also met them and announced to them the grace of God. But they that were of the circumcision disputed with him." 11:17, it adds "from giving them the Holy Spirit when they believed on him." 11:26 is recast to read, "And hearing that Saul was in Tarsus he went away looking for him, and when he met up with him he encouraged him to come to Antioch. And when they arrived they mingled for a whole year with the church and taught much people, and then the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch." In 11:28 the important reading "And there was much rejoicing, and when *we* had conversed together, one of them Agabus. . ." making an early "we" section in the book, a reading widely attested in Latin writ-

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 171-173.

ings. 12:10 has already been noticed. In 14:2, 4 the "Western" text understands two separate attacks made at Iconium and reads, "But the chiefs of the synagogues of the Jews and their rulers stirred up persecution against the saints and made the minds of the Gentiles ill-disposed towards the brethren: but the Lord soon gave peace" and in verse 4 adds "and others with the apostles, cleaving to them for the sake of the word of God. And the Jews with the Gentiles raised persecution again a second time and they stoned them and turned them out of the city." To verse 7 it adds "and the whole multitude was moved by the teaching. And Paul and Barnabas stayed some time in Lystra." The "Western" text expands 14:19 to read "and as they spent some time there and taught, there came certain Jews from Iconium and Antioch, and while they (the apostles) were discoursing with boldness they persuaded the crowds to revolt against them, saying, Nothing that they say is true; it is all lies. And having stirred up the crowds and having stoned Paul, they dragged him out of the city. . ." 15:1ff. is recast to read, "And certain men of the sect of the Pharisees who believed came down from Jerusalem and were teaching the brethren, Unless you are circumcised and walk in the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved. And when no small strife and dissension arose between them and Paul and Barnabas, for Paul affirmed and said that the converts should remain just as they were, those who had come from Jerusalem ordered Paul and Barnabas themselves and certain others to go up to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem that they might be judged before them concerning this question." 15:5 is reworded to read "But those who had ordered them to go up to the elders rose up and said that they must circumcise them and command them to observe the law of Moses." 15: 20, 29. Here the "Western" text omits "and things strangled" and adds "and let them not do to others what they would not have done to themselves," the negative form of the Golden Rule. 16:30, after "brought them out" it adds, "having secured the others." 16:35 reads, "But when it was day, the praetors came together into the forum and, calling to mind the earthquake that had taken place, they were affrighted and sent for the lictors. . ." 16:39, 40 reads "and having arrived with many friends at the prison they besought them to go out, saying, We did not know the truth about you, that you were righteous men. And having led them out they besought them saying, Depart from this city lest perhaps they come together to us again, crying out against you. And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they related all that the Lord had done to them." The "Western" text recasts 17:4 to read, "And some of them were persuaded, and many of the Godfearers adhered to the teaching, and large number of the Greeks, and not a few of the wives of the principal men." 18:2-5 reads, "And he found Aquila, a man of Pontus by race, a Jew, who had lately come from Italy with Priscilla

his wife, and he joined them. Now these had come out of Rome because Claudius Caesar had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome and they settled in Achaia. And Paul became known to Aquila because he was of the same race and the same trade, and he stayed with them and worked; for they were tentmakers by trade. And entering into the synagogue each sabbath day he held discourse inserting the name of the Lord Jesus, and sought to persuade not only Jews but also Greeks. But when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia, Paul was constrained by the word, testifying to the Jews that the Lord Jesus was the Christ. And when there had been much discussion and the scriptures were interpreted . . ." 18:21 reads "but taking leave of them, he said, I must by all means keep the coming feast day in Jerusalem, but I will return again unto you if God will." 18:27, "And some Corinthians staying in Ephesus had heard him and asked him to cross over with them to their own country. And when he agreed, the Ephesians wrote to the disciples in Corinth to receive the man; who while he stayed in Achaia was of great help to the churches." 19:1 reads, "But though Paul wished to go according to his own plan to Jerusalem, the Holy Spirit told him to return to Asia." 19:9 has already been noticed as inserting after "Tyrannus," "from the fifth to the tenth hour." 21:1 adds "and Myra," after Patara. 21:16 is recast to read, "And these brought us to those with whom we were to lodge. And when we arrived at a certain village we were with a certain disciple named Mnason. And going out thence we came to Jerusalem." 21:25 reads, "But concerning the Gentiles who have believed, they have nothing to say to thee, for we sent a message judging that they were to observe nothing of the sort save to guard themselves from what has been sacrificed to idols and blood and fornication." 24:6 adds the reading found in the KJV, "and we would have judged him according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, commanding his accusers to come before thee." 24:10, after "And when the governor had beckoned to him," it adds, "to make his defense, he took up a godlike attitude, and said . . ." 25:24ff., after "crying that" it adds, "both in Jerusalem and here, that I should deliver him to them for punishment without any defence. But I could not deliver him because of the commands which we have from the emperor. But if anyone wished to accuse him, I said he should accompany me to Caesarea where he was being guarded. When they came, they cried out that he should be taken away from life. But when I had heard the one side and then the other, I found out that he was by no means worthy of death. But when I said, Do you wish to be judged by them in Jerusalem? he appealed to Caesar." 26:1 reads, "Then Paul confident and encouraged by the Holy Spirit stretched forth his hand and made his defence." 27:1 expands the verse to read, "So then the governor decided to send him to Caesar. And on the morrow he summoned a certain centurion by name Julius (of the cohort

Augusta) and he delivered to him Paul and the other prisoners." 28:16 reads, "And when we entered Rome the centurion delivered his prisoners to the stratopedarch but Paul was allowed to stay by himself outside the camp with the soldier who guarded him." To 28:31 the "Western" text adds, "saying that this is the Christ, Jesus the Son of God, by whom the whole world is to be judged."

Notes on Selected Passages:

"THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT"—Acts 2:38

R. L. Roberts, Jr.

The title of this brief study offers no little difficulty of interpretation. This is due to the nature of the expression. Both nouns, "gift" and "Holy Spirit," are genitive (possessive case) in form and their force in this particular instance can be either of two relations. The form, strictly speaking, is that of a condensed clause or at least it possesses the force of such. If Peter had expressed the idea in a clause instead of a somewhat elliptical phrase, little or no doubt about its meaning would remain. The character of the expression creates a problem of interpretation.

Speaking of the genitive case, S. W. Green says,

> The most obvious use of a Genitive is to complete or define the reference of another noun, in ways answering to the variety of relations expressed by the English Preposition *of*, eg., A cup *of the king, of gold, of water, of great beauty, of value,* etc.[1]

One of the various relations expressed by the genitive case is that of apposition: "consisting in." This use of the genitive we call the "genitive of apposition." Often two nouns or a noun and a pronoun are placed together so that the second, or adjunct term, explains the meaning of the first more fully. When so used, the second word stands in apposition (from *ad*, to; *prono*, I place) to the first. "The sign of circumcision" (Rom. 4:11), i.e., the sign consisting in circumcision, and "the city of Thyatira" (Acts 16:14) are frequently given as examples of the appositional genitive.[2] If in our title phrase the term "Holy Spirit" is in apposition to "the gift," then "the Holy Spirit" is the explanation of the term "gift." But, there are other possible relations between the two terms and, therefore, the problem of deciding which relation was intended is presented.

The difficulty is brought clearly into view, when we note as does Green that

> The same phrase may occur with differing force of the Genitive: *he ayape tou theo* may mean "the love which is directed

---

[1]Green, S. Walter, *Lessons in New Testament Greek* (London, Andrew Melrose, 1906), p. 67.

[2]For a longer list of examples and a good discussion of the genitive of apposition the reader is referred to an article by the editor in Vol. 3, No. 1, pages 36 and 37 of the *Restoration Quarterly.*

towards God" ("Objective Genitive") or "the love which God feels" (Possessive or "Subjective Genitive").[3]

The phrase "the gift of the Holy Spirit" can mean the gift given by the Holy Spirit" (Subjective Genitive), or, as we have already seen, "the Holy Spirit Himself as the gift" (Appositional Genitive). The grammar permits either interpretation; it does not allow both, of course. The context must be brought to bear upon the problem. The grammar is of no help. After the form is clearly understood the force of it is still to be determined, for the expression is identically the same whichever relation is meant. Green is right when he states that "the interpretation of particular instances is a matter of context, not of grammar."[4]

The context permits only one explanation. Since there are only two possible explanations of the phrase, one must be ruled out. The expression "Holy Spirit" has either an appositional relation to the word "gift" or it has a subjective relation to it, i.e., the Holy Spirit is the name of the subject of the action denoted by the word "gift" or the Holy Spirit is acting to give some gift—whatever it is.[5]

If we say that the relation is appositional, the question that arises is, "How do we know that this phrase has this force and not that of the subjective genitive?" The answer is: "By the context." It cannot be successfully shown that this is *not* the force without showing that something else other than the Holy Spirit is the gift.

Suppose that we grant that the force is subjective. The question that must then be answered is: "What is the gift of the Holy Spirit?" What is there in the immediate context that identifies this gift, if it is something other than the Holy Spirit Himself? Some have suggested that the gift is "salvation." In that case the phrase is but a repetition of what is already stated in the phrase "remission of sins" and is not an additional blessing to the remission of sins. This alone makes it very unlikely that salvation is the gift. Such is seen also from the fact that the conjunctive *kai* introduces the clause "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" as the promise of an additional blessing and therefore, a different one from that of receiving the remission of sins. The translations of Goodspeed and Moffatt render the clause "Then ye shall receive . . ." Salvation is "the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8), not the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Other things—the word, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, etc.—have been suggested as possible explanations of the term. But, as in the case of salvation, the Holy Spirit functions as God's agent in bestowing the gifts; God is in fact the giver of every gift. So says James:

---

[4]*Ibid.*

[5]See Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge, 1945), p. 42.

[3]Green, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

> Every good act of giving and every perfect gift is from above, coming from the Father of lights, . . . (James 1:17).[6]

The miraculous gifts of the Spirit are described by Paul as "the manifestation of the Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:7). By this it is evident that these gifts of the Holy Spirit were in some measure the Holy Spirit Himself. McGarvey and Pendleton rightly comment that "Each of the gifted ones had some power which manifested that the Spirit of God was with him."[7] These gifts were evidently bestowed by the laying on of the hand of the apostles (See Acts 8:17-20; Rom. 1:11; 2 Tim. 1:6) which was a means of bestowing the Spirit. So, *ta pneumatika,* the spiritual gifts, certainly cannot refer to anything other than receiving the Holy Spirit with the result being the receiving of spiritual endowments called *charismata* (1 Cor. 12). This most certainly does not show that "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in Acts 2:38 is something other than receiving the Holy Spirit.

The context of Acts 2 offers nothing that would identify a gift imparted by the Holy Spirit to those who repent and are baptized. If "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is subjective, then the gift certainly is not identified by the phrase itself. If "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is appositional, then, the gift is identified by the phrase itself without further need of investigation. One can see that this is the simplest interpretation.

There is more uncertainty about what the gift is, if the phrase is taken to be subjective. The people who heard these words on Pentecost were not told what the gift was, if the relation of the term "Holy Spirit" is subjective to "the gift." They were left to guess and so are we. If the phrase is appositional, then the people understood that the Holy Spirit, which God had "poured out" upon the apostles in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy (v. 17), and which they saw and heard in miraculous manifestations, would be given to them when they repented and were baptized. "The promise of the Holy Spirit" (v. 33) is the Holy Spirit Himself. Jesus having received it of the Father had poured forth the Spirit upon the apostles and this same Holy Spirit Peter promised as a gift to those who heard his words. He made it plain that the promise was to them and their children, and "to all them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." If it is not the Holy Spirit, there is no certainty about the identity of the gift.

"The promise," v. 39, certainly refers to "the promise of the Holy Spirit" already mentioned in the context (verse 33). Some hold that "the promise" is "the promise of Abraham," but such is not even in the context and could not be the object referred to as a previous reference in the context. The definite article in the expression "*the promise*" v. 39, is used "to denote previous reference" or "to point out an object the identity of which is defined by some previous reference made to it in the context" (Dana and Mantey, p. 141), therefore

---

[6]*Englishman's Greek English NT.*

"the promise" could refer to nothing save "*the promise* of the Holy Spirit" in verse 33. This "previous reference" defines the latter reference in verse 39. "The promise of Abraham" could not be the previous reference when it is not even in the context! (See also a parallel in Acts 20:11 "*the* bread" as denoting bread previously mentioned in 20:7.)

"The gift of the Holy Spirit" is just as much a result of repentance and baptism as "the remission of sins" is, according to the language used here and this promise (the gift of the Spirit) was made, not only to those who heard it but also to their "children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Thus the reference is to a gift to everyone to whom the promise was made, not just to the people on Pentecost, but to "as many as" the Lord shall call. Of course these also must repent and be baptized to receive the blessing.

Now the question arises whether this gift of the Holy Spirit, since it was of universal application in the church to which all "the called" were added, is miraculous or otherwise. If miraculous, then it would be either "the baptism of the Holy Spirit" or some gift imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands. These manifestations of the Spirit would be to all that the Lord calls even today, since the promise was to as many as would be called. But such manifestations are not received today as is apparent from lack of evidence, e.g., speaking in tongues, etc. The gift was not necessarily anything miraculous in nature and must be an indwelling of the Spirit unaccompanied by miraculous evidence of His presence but evidenced by "the fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. 5:22).

The weight of evidence, not only in the immediate context but in the entire word of God, is in favor of viewing the use of the genitive in the phrase under consideration as appositional. The complete phrase "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is used in only one other place in the word of God (Acts 10:45) and it very definitely refers to receiving the Holy Spirit, as the context shows. Before closing it might be well that we notice a reference by Thayer. Commenting on the use of *dorea* (gift) he says that it is used "with an epexegetical genitive of the thing given, viz. *tou hagiou pneumatos*, Acts 2:38; 10:45."[8]

In conclusion we give four reasons for accepting the view that "the gift of the Holy Spirit" means the Holy Spirit as a gift, or that the phrase is an appositional genitive. 1. It is the simplest explanation. 2. It is in harmony with the immediate context as well as the entire Bible. 3. Such a view of the phrase by those who heard it means immediate identification of the gift as an additional bless-

[7]J. W. McGarvey and P. Y. Pendleton, *Commentary on Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and Romans* (Cincinnati, Standard, 1916), p. 122.

[8]Thayer, J. H., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (New York, 1889), p. 161.

ing to the remission of sins. 4. Most scholars so interpret the phrase.

God does give the Holy Spirit to men when they obey him (Acts 5:32). When God gives a man the Holy Spirit, it is "the gift of the Holy Spirit." When God gives salvation, it is "the gift of salvation" (appositional genitive); but this salvation might be viewed as "the gift of God" (subjective genitive). Likewise, the Holy Spirit is "a gift of God" (subjective genitive) to man when he obeys God. What God gives is the Holy Spirit as a gift or "the gift of the Holy Spirit" (appositional genitive).

"ADDED TO THE CHURCH"—Acts 2:47

J. D. Thomas

"And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (—AV) ("together" is added to verse 1 of the 3rd chapter in the AV).

"And the Lord added to them day by day those that were saved" (ARV).

The above translations, by the King James and the American Standard Versions, respectively, point up the basic problem that is involved in this verse of scripture. A very real question here for the average person is, does the expression, "to the church," occur in the original language and is it therefore required in a correct English translation of the verse? If the expression "to the church" was not in the original language, then what caused the King James translators to insert the phrase in their translation, and what does the Greek actually mean in such a case? Is there any legitimate way that the word "church," or even the idea, could be considered to be definitely implied in the meaning of the original language?

The Greek of Nestle's text reads, *ho de kurios prosetithei tous sodzomenous kath' hemeran epi to auto. Ho de kurios* clearly means "and the Lord." The *tous sodzomenous* technically means "those who are becoming saved"—a process still in progress, but no doubt with reference to the total group of the saved but not meaning here "a continuing process within each individual" (cf. Weymouth's Translation). Hackett's commentary observes (p. 73) that "The doctrine is that those who embrace the gospel adopt the infallible means of being saved." The *prosetithei* means (Hackett, p. 73) "added (imperfect with reference to *kath' hemeran*), brings to view God's agency in that acceptance of the gospel which insures salvation." So the centrality of God's activity in the "adding" process is clear, and the adding is, of course, contingent upon human choice and active faith. The *kath' hemeran* is a common idiom meaning "daily," and thus we see that the sentence is really not problematical at all except for the *epi to auto*, the use of which here has seemingly confused scholars for a long period of time.

Jackson and Lake in their famous study of Acts, *Beginnings of Christianity,* point out (II, p. 143) that *epi to auto* "can only mean 'together' or 'in the same place' . . . But in this passage this meaning is obviously inadmissible." Any number of instances can be cited to show that the idiom is commonly translated as "together" or as "in the same place" and surely every possible chance should be given for it to have such a meaning even here unless it proves absolutely impossible.

The Textus Receptus and the King James version both include the translation of *epi to auto* as a part of 3:1, as some say "to get rid of the difficulty," but this procedure does not seem logical in view of the text. The Antiochian text has the expression *te ekklesia* in verse 47, and the Western or D Text has *epi to auto te ekklesia.* Several scholars feel that *te ekklesia* ("in the church," or "to the church") was added into these texts because of the "difficulty" of *epi to auto* and that *te ekklesia* was not in the original and does not, therefore, belong in an English translation.

One proposed solution to the *epi to auto* problem is that of C. C. Torrey, who is quite famous for his efforts to prove that many portions of the New Testament were originally written in Aramaic, including the material of Acts 1:1 to 15:35. Jackson and Lake (II, p. 143ff.; IV, p. 30) approve of Torrey's effort and seem to think that his theory is a valid explanation of the problem.

Torrey says that *epi to auto* would be equivalent to the Hebrew *yakedday,* which "makes good sense in other contexts but not here." (cf. *Harvard Theological Review,* 1917).

> The problem is solved at once if *epi to auto* be translated back into Aramaic by the adverbial compound *lakeddaa,* which has in the Judean dialect of Aramaic the meaning "greatly," "exceedingly." This second sense is what is needed instead of "together," and the probability that this is the true explanation of the difficulty is greatly increased by the fact that the word has this significance only in Judean Aramaic and might well be unknown to the editor of Acts. . . The meaning of the original source would be, "The Lord added greatly to the saved."

This would have the main point of the phrase to mean that the number of converts were increasing rapidly, and thus the "adding" was intensified.

Jackson and Lake's sense of difficulty of *epi to auto* is made more clear by their comment (V. p. 140):

> It is true that *epi to auto* in 2:44 and 47 might be interpreted to mean actually living together; but it is almost impossible to believe that after saying there were 3000 converts the writers can have thought that they were all in one house.

Without trying to evaluate Torrey's arguments on Aramaic originals for the entire fifteen chapters of Acts, not to mention the gospel materials, since he is rather effectively challenged elsewhere,[1]

we will look only at his reasoning here concerning *epi to auto.*

It is true that clear-cut "mistranslations" are excellent evidence for the fact of translation, but it seems that here Torrey's "improvement" is not as good as the normal meaning of "together" for *epi to auto.* The term "exceedingly" seems strained. To say that the "adding" was done greatly or exceedingly, as a means of saying that the number of those responding to obedience of the gospel precepts increased greatly, is at least to be very peripheral rather than pointed in expression. He could easily have said it in the latter manner, as he did in 4:4 and 4:32. Further, he seems to be in a considerable strain to have to "chase down something" "in only the Judean dialect" of Aramaic in order to have his solution.

"Together," as the meaning of *epi to auto* in 2:47, is not at all difficult, in spite of Torrey and even of Jackson and Lake. The context easily allows it. In verse 41, 3000 "were added," and we realize that they logically had to be added in some way to something. In verse 44, we have *epi to auto* used, and no one questions that it here means "together." It seems that Torrey is unduly anxious for an Aramaic mistranslation, and that Jackson and Lake are unduly insisting that "together" means "in the same *place*"—that is, that it would have to mean "together, in the sense of the flesh and blood bodies physically present at the same time in one physical location." Obviously, this is not at all necessary. The Lord could add the increasing number of new converts "together" in a *logical* sense, without its needing to be *physical.* He could, and no doubt this is the true meaning, add them to a newly founded spiritual group or relationship—to a mystical (if one insists) body. Surely this is that to which the 3000 of verse 41 were added, and if one insists that they were added to the apostles (or perhaps to even the 120 disciples of 1:15), it still means to the *group* who were now bonded together in spiritual union!

Without here arguing the textual problem of whether the Western text and the Antiochian text are correct in having the words *en te ekklesia,* or *te ekklesia,* it is pertinent to observe that the group to which all the converts in Acts 2 were added is that same group, bonded together in spiritual union, that continues to be discussed without interruption on into the later chapters of Acts and which, beginning in 5:11 and constantly thereafter, is called "the church." Actually, therefore, the words "in the church" or "to the church" are not needed in Acts 2:47 for the New Testament interpreter to know that it was the church to which the converts were added and clearly *could not have been anything else*! If the Western and Antiochian texts were guilty of *supplying* the word "church" in Acts 2:47, it was because they felt the obvious meaning so clearly and not because it was "to merely get rid of a difficulty."

---

[1]See E. C. Colwell's *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

CHRIST'S KINGDOM ADVANCING—Acts 13-14

R. C. Bell

In the first eleven chapters of the book of Acts, Luke tells the story of the establishment and the growth of the church among the Jews, and of its spreading through Samaria to the great heathen city of Antioch, Syria, some three hundred miles northward, where it took deep root among the Gentiles. These eleven chapters, plus the twelfth chapter with its return to Jerusalem, comprise a major division of the book, in which Peter, to whom Jesus before his death gave the keys of his kingdom, is the human leader.

The other major division of the Acts, consisting of the rest of the book, gives an account of the campaigns of Paul, whom the risen, glorified Jesus chose, as personally as he had chosen the original apostles, to wage absolute war against his arch-enemy, the devil, the usurping god of "This present evil world," until his kingdom was established in the strategic points over the pagan Roman Empire. Paul succeeds Peter as the leading human actor in the world-shaking drama of Christ's advancing kingdom.

This geographical order of the development of his kingdom was announced by Christ to his apostles just before his ascension: "But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea and Samaria, unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). The church in Antioch became the cradle of Gentile Christianity. It was Paul's home-base throughout the several years of his evangelistic activity—each of his three great missionary journeys began and ended there.

The first of these journeys (Acts 13, 14) was instigated by the Holy Spirit, who said to this Antiochian church, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. . . And they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit," began the momentous journey which may be likened unto the first, bold flight of an eagle that is later to fly in wider circles and into fiercer storms. This Scripture very definitely sets forth the age-abiding truth that the Holy Spirit administers the church through men as his instruments. These two chapters are perfect, unchanging guidance for the church as she performs her supreme task of establishing her Lord's kingdom in self-sustaining, self-governing, self-propagating congregations—the indigenous church—over the earth. In principle these two chapters cover for all time the whole ground of missionary work.

Paul's first recorded sermon was delivered near the beginning of this journey in Antioch, Pisidia, to a mixed audience of Jews and Gentiles. On the brink of the great, epochal break-through of the Gospel into the heathen world, that was to change the current of history and to become the watershed that divides humanity into the dichotomy of the church and the world, the time and the occasion

were ripe for a clear, comprehensive, cogent proclamation of the fundamental facts, doctrines, and working principles of Christianity.

This sermon makes the mediatorial kingdom of God in Christ, with its vast sweep through time and its outreach into eternity, the unifying factor of the whole Bible. The working out of God's purpose of restoring fallen mankind through the Seed of the woman, made known on earth when Adam and Eve sinned, constitutes the warp and the woof that are woven into the Bible to make it throughout one seamless fabric. The Jews in Paul's audience, especially, should have seen that in following Moses through, they would have of necessity become Christians, even as Christ had told them: "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me, for he wrote of me" (John 5:46). Indeed, Christianity fulfills God's promises to the fathers, and meets all legitimate expectations of the Jews—it is implicit in the Old Testament.

A glance at the sermon reveals that its dominant topics are God's government and God's grace. God chose, delivered from slavery, nursed in the wilderness, settled in Canaan, and ruled over Israel for centuries until King David, into whose dynasty Christ was born about a thousand years later, only to be crucified. *But God* raised him from the dead! In short, through a long series of changes, successively increasing in usefulness and culminating in a divine Savior, God presided over the destiny of Israel. Had he not in grace preserved the ungrateful, disobedient, idolatrous nation could it have escaped the doom of sinking into oblivion along with contemporaneous nations?

Upon this granitic, historical foundation, Paul erects Christianity: "Be it known unto you therefore, brethren, that through this man is proclaimed to you the remission of sins: and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses." Shifting the base of operation from Jerusalem to Antioch, and of the human instrument from Peter to Paul, denotes a shifting infinitely more important and heavenly to Adam's race, namely, the transference of the center of operating power from man to God. Men cannot be justified by the law of Moses, or by any other law, because the principle of law requires that they earn and merit justification by doing "All the things that are written in the book of the law" (Gal. 3:10). But since fallen men cannot render this perfect obedience, "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Rom. 3:20).

The provisional, national Mosaic covenant was not given as a means of justifying men, but as a means of teaching them by their constant disobedience of the law that, inasmuch as legal justification was above their natural reach, they must needs cease striving after it in their own purely human strength and throw themselves upon the mercy and grace of God that he in Christ might strengthen and enable them "With power through his Spirit in the inward man" (Eph. 3:16). This shifts the basic pivot of power in Christianity

from man to God. The over-all purpose of the law of Moses, with law on its face but grace in its heart, was therefore to lead men to Christ. Law and grace are not incompatible, for God is ever both lawful and gracious.

The Mosaic covenant and the Christian covenant, both of which embody God's immutable moral law, are two stages in God's restorative movement, so different that they cannot co-exist and work conjointly, for each eats out the heart of the other. The different location of the center of power of these respective stages is the crucial point of their difference. God's former, man-centered system of law makes void his present, Christ-centered system of grace: "For if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for nought" (Gal. 2:21). Paul says that he had to die to law as a means of justification before God could justify him by grace (Gal. 2:19). God himself lives according to his law, which is of course, therefore, holy, righteous, good, and spiritual (Rom. 7); and since Christian love and grace do all (even more) in human relationships that law requires, Christianity is God's perfected way of making lawful men without their becoming legalists. Christianity is essentially a divine-human, personal encounter, in which both the ethics and the dynamics are from God, in Christ, through the Spirit.

Probably the most insidious, deadly wound that Satan has inflicted upon the church from its beginning onward is his seducing Christians into exalting what they do for God to the disparagement of what God does for them. This virtually perverts, as the Galatians perverted (Gal. 1), Christianity into just another system of law in which men must earn and deserve their salvation. Said Christ to his disciples: "Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke 10:17-20).

The audience, hearing Paul discourse upon God, sin, and the remission of sins, was sufficiently interested to invite him to preach again the next sabbath. The spirit of man is so made that it responds to these deepest things in life, just as his ear is made to respond to sound. The preachers urged those who followed them when the meeting broke up "To continue in the grace of God." The new idea that everything was under the control of one supreme, beneficent God, who was good enough to justify "Every one that believeth," regardless of race, religion, or culture, was so exciting and satisfying to heathen people that the next sabbath "Almost the whole city was gathered together to hear the word of God."

"But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with jealousy, and contradicted the things which were spoken by Paul and Barnabas." The Jewish nation, which God had been readying for many generations to be his gateway to the Gentile nations, had become, however, so snobbish and bigoted that they refused to go on with him in fulfilling his promise to Abraham. Christianity was too big, rich, and free for their poor, little, selfish souls. Therefore, forsooth! the eagle's wings had to be clipped lest it fly their private

coop. They would not have enough Christ to hamper either their religion or their business. How human!

The Jews never understood their place in God's grand redemptive enterprise, but in adamant ignorance clung with dead hands to their dead forms, and to their traditional opinion that Judaism was God's final word to man. Paul characterized them later: "Who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved; to fill up their sin always: but wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (1 Thess. 2:15, 16). And again, Christ said to his disciples: "Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy" (Luke 12:1). Did not Christ fear that Christians would make the fatal mistake that the Jews were making?

"And Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly and said: "It was necessary that the word of God be spoken to you. Seeing that ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. . . And as the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." This verse, taken with the preceding verse, in a series of word-contrasts that throws the reaction of the Jews and of the Gentiles to the Gospel, respectively, over against each other, sheds much light upon the question of the relationship between divine sovereignty and human freedom.

The Jews were *jealous*, but the Gentiles were *glad*; the Jews *contradicted*, but the Gentiles *glorified*, the word of God; the Jews *blasphemed*, but the Gentiles *believed*. The Jews judged themselves unworthy of eternal life by rejecting Christ of their own free will, while the Gentiles judged themselves worthy of eternal life by accepting Christ of their own free will. One chose to blaspheme and the other to believe the word of God, and each was wholly responsible for his choice and its consequences. Competent Greek scholars say that the word translated "ordained" could just as well be rendered "disposed." Then, the sentence reads: "As many as were disposed to eternal life believed." Does not this agree with the teaching of the Bible as a whole, and with the language and context of these two verses?

"And the word of the Lord spread abroad throughout all the region. But the Jews stirred up a persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and cast them out of their borders." When the evangelists left Antioch, they left a church "Filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit," and went on to plant churches successively at Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. The pattern of initial favorable impression, soon followed by opposition to the Gospel, set on this journey shows that it takes earnest, honest, penitent men, men really converted from self and the world to Christ and his church, men knowing "That through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of

God," to follow Christ's self-denying, flesh-crucifying program through to the end.

The outward thrust of the journey ended at Derbe, and the apostles retraced their steps confirming and exhorting the new disciples "To continue in the faith." They organized the congregations by appointing "Elders in every church." After an absence of some two years, probably, they returned to Antioch, Syria, "Gathered the church together," and "Rehearsed all things that God had done with them and that he had opened a door of faith (not of works) unto the Gentiles. The theme of Paul's first preserved sermon—the government and the grace of God—dominates this report. God through the missionaries had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles. "Whatsoever they did" God "Was the Doer of it."

"APOSTLES"—Acts 14:14

William M. Green

"But when the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of it, they tore their garments . . ." The reader is here surprised by an uncommon use of the word "apostles." What does it mean? How many apostles were there? Were there various kinds, and if so, how many? What was their work, or office? When did the office cease? These questions have long been discussed by the greatest Bible scholars, but without reaching complete agreement. After writing twenty-two pages, Kirsopp Lake sums up: "The one thing certain is that certainty cannot be attained."[1]

The Greek noun *apostolos* is derived from the verb *apostellein*, which means to send away, to dispatch on some mission; the noun, therefore, means "one sent, a messenger." It is so translated in three New Testament passages (John 13:16; 2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25). When Jesus selected the Twelve and sent them out, he presumably used an Aramaic word later translated *apostolos*. This word, however, is rare in the Gospels. It occurs once in Matthew (10:2), once in Mark (6:30), five times in Luke (6:13 etc.), and never in John with reference to the Twelve. But in Acts it is the regular designation for that group. Only in Acts 14 is it extended beyond their number, when applied to Barnabas and Paul.

Paul mentions the Twelve but once (1 Cor. 15:50), and does not limit the title "apostle" to that group. Rather, he insists on his own apostleship, and frequently mentions others who share the designation. He and Barnabas were distinguished from "the other apostles" by the fact that they remained unmarried (1 Cor. 9:5f.). In Jerusalem Paul met Cephas, but none of "the other apostles" except James the Lord's brother (Gal. 1:19). Since it is clear from John 7:5 that Jesus' brothers were not among the Twelve, James

[1] *Beginnings of Christianity* I:V (1933), 58.

can be an apostle only in the wider sense. In 1 Cor. 15:5-7 Paul speaks of Jesus' appearance to Cephas, then to the Twelve, then to five hundred, then "to all the apostles." Here "the apostles" would seem to be a larger group than the Twelve. Andronicus and Junias, kinsmen and fellow-prisoners of Paul, were "of note among the apostles" (Rom. 16:7). Most commentators, ancient and modern, take this to mean that they were distinguished members of the larger group of "apostles." If the "we" of 1 Thess. 2:6 refers to the three writers of the letter (1:1), then Silvanus and Timothy had the standing of apostles, along with Paul. Moreover, the existence of a class of "false apostles" (2 Cor. 11:13) is conceivable only if the churches knew of a class of true apostles other than the Twelve.

A sampling of Biblical scholarship over the last hundred years reveals the variety of views which have been maintained. Dean Alford in his comments on Acts 14:14, Rom. 16:7, and 1 Cor. 15:5-7 (*Greek Testament* II, 1861, pp. 158, 466f., 604) finds the word *apostolos* used in three senses: first of the Twelve, then of fifteen (including Paul, Barnabas, and James), then of a wider group which included Andronicus and Junias, the "messengers of the churches" of 2 Cor. 8:23, and Silvanus and Timotheus. In 1865 J. B. Lightfoot published an essay on "The Name and Office of an Apostle" (*Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* 10th ed. 1890, 92-101). He remarks that the Twelve were sent primarily to the Jews, while the apostles appointed later were sent to the Gentiles. They constituted the first order in the church, and were eye-witnesses of Christ's resurrection. Paul met this qualification as well as the Twelve, and James the Lord's brother; this was quite possibly true also of Barnabas, Andronicus, Junias, and Silvanus. J. W. McGarvey follows Lightfoot (see note on Acts 14:14 in *New Commentary on Acts of Apostles,* 1892, p. 43): the title, he thinks, was probably due to their having been under the personal instruction of Jesus, and possibly to their having been persent when the great commission was given.

The German church historian Harnack set forth his view in 1902 (English translation, *The Expansion of Christianity* I, 1904, 398-408). He argues that in Matthew, Mark and John the word "apostle" is not a distinctive name for the Twelve: it has only its basic meaning of "one sent." In Paul, however, the term is one of special distinction, belonging to himself and his fellow-missionaries as well as to those who were apostles before him. The essential thing is a call, accompanied with special gifts and duties. The Twelve are set in first place, but the Lord has given him a dignity not inferior to theirs. Thus Paul's efforts to fix the value of his own apostleship has established the Twelve in a new and special dignity. Luke, Harnack finds, is guided partly by the synoptic tradition, partly by Paul. The chief mission of the apostles, that is, Peter and the eleven, is the founding of the church, and the title is given to them regularly throughout the book of Acts; by anticipation it is also used several times in the Gospel of Luke. But the Pauline usage also appears in

Acts 14 when Barnabas and Paul are called apostles.

Following the liberal tradition, Kirsopp Lake in 1933 discusses the problem of "The Twelve and the Apostles" in his *Beginnings of Christianity* I:V, 37-59. He thinks that Jesus first sent the Twelve only to preach and to cast out demons, but that in Acts they have a new function and a new name. As "apostles" they are given a message about Jesus, and become the inspired and miraculously powerful heads of a new society, the church. They have power to confer the gift of the Holy Spirit. But in Paul's epistles the "apostles" are not the Twelve—there is no special limitation of the number. The term doubtless originated as the translation of the Aramaic *shaliach,* used by Jesus of those he sent out to preach. It was probably in Antioch that the Greek term *apostolos* came into use, and there it was applied not only to the Twelve, but to others such as Barnabas and Paul. Luke's account of Paul's conversion is intended to set him on an equality with the Twelve, both as specially called by Christ, and as a witness of his resurrection. In the other New Testament writings and in the Apostolic Fathers the term occasionally has the wider use, but the tendency is to restrict it to the Twelve and Paul.

In 1933 K. H. Rengstorf published in Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch* a long article later translated as an English book, *Apostleship* (London, 1952. 76 pp). The origin and meaning of the word is discussed more fully than ever before. The apostle, he says, is not a mere messenger, but a representative sent out with authority: thus Jesus is the "Apostle and High Priest of our confession" (Heb. 3:1). Besides the Twelve and Paul there were other apostles, but their number is unknown. They were witnesses of the facts about Jesus, specially called, and endowed with special power. They belonged to the first generation, and the office did not become permanent in the church.[3]

---

[2]K. H. Bengstorf, *Apostleship* (London, 1952), 14.

[3]Other important articles may be found in F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia* (London, 1908), 22-41; H. M. Gwatkin, in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* I (New York, 1902), 126; J. C. Lambert in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* I (Chicago, 1937), 202-204; and A. Wikenhauser in *Reallexikon fuer Antike und Christentum* I (Stuttgart, 1950), 553-555. Rengstorf and Wikenhauser give an ample bibliography of titles in French and German, as well as English.

THESE NECESSARY THINGS—Acts 15:28-29

Jay Smith

It is obvious that Luke regards the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15 as of key significance in the history of the church,[1] for here the

---

[1]This writer holds to the identity of Acts 15 with Gal. 2. See *Restoration Quarterly,* Vol. 2, No. 2, 1958, p. 52.

freedom of the Gentile and of the church from Judaism was established, an issue which runs almost the length of the book of Acts and Paul's letters. (This writer holds that the Council of Acts 15 and Paul's Jerusalem visit of Gal. 2:1ff are identical.)

The rapid expansion of the church among Gentiles at Antioch and in the hinterland of Asia Minor posed a serious problem for conservative Jewish Christians who feared that such a tide of pagans would also mean a corresponding establishment of Gentile "morality" in the church. Both for this reason and also that they conceived of the church as only an extension of Judaism, a conservative party began to demand the circumcision of all Gentile converts.[2] In effect, a Gentile became a proselyte to Judaism, and the church merely another sect of Judaism. Many Pharisees had believed without relinquishing their previous beliefs.[3]

At the Council, upon the testimony of the success of Barnabas and Paul among Gentiles (interpreted as a sign of God's approval),[4] Peter's testimony of his preaching to Cornelius,[5] and the counsel of James,[6] the fundamental principle of the gospel that Jew and Gentile are saved by the same terms was established, and a letter reiterating these proceedings was written and carried by accredited witnesses to the churches of Syria and Cilicia.[7]

Both the statement of James in the Council and in the letter, while releasing the Gentiles from circumcision and the Law of Moses, list some "necessary things" from which Gentiles are to abstain. The four are: "meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication."[8]

Several attitudes have prevailed toward these four prohibitions. They range from those who hold that Paul could never have accepted such limitation upon his Gentile churches, to those who see these limitations as a compromise to Jewish scruples, to those who see them as a reflection of the "Noahic Covenant" of Genesis 9 limitations as a reflection of the "Noahic Covenant" of Genesis 9 (and therefore binding upon Gentiles as a universal, minimum requirement to all mankind), or to others as just a statement of basic morality set forth to indicate that liberty from the Law did not mean license.

James' reason for suggesting only these four prohibitions is "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him . . ."[9] Does this have reference to a standard of morality fairly well established throughout the Mediterranean world through the influence of the synagogues? Or does it indicate to those who wished to bind the whole Mosaic Law upon Gentiles that this seeming compromise would do no harm to Moses in that Gentiles still had ample opportunity to learn the Law, and that the extensive preaching of Moses had

[2]Acts 15:1, 5. [3]Acts 15:5.
[4]Cf. Acts 15:3-4, 12; 11:17-18; and 5:38-39.
[5]Acts 15:7-11. [6]Acts 15:13-21. [7]Acts 15:23, 27.
[8]Acts 15:29. [9]Acts 15:21.

failed to attract the allegiance of these people anyway (i.e., Moses could suffer no loss of allegiance which had never been his)? Both have much to commend them, but the latter seems to fit the case better.

When no principle was involved, Paul was one of the most conciliatory of men,[10] and asked stronger Christians to abstain voluntarily from practices offensive to weaker brethren.[11] But note elsewhere that he does not forbid eating of meats offered to idols, which was true of practically all meat offered for sale in the marketplace (shambles), unless someone specifically volunteers the information, and then the Christian is to abstain *because of the conscience of the one who informs him!*[12] The "pollutions of idols" which James mentions, or the "meats offered to idols" as it stands in the letter, probably imply public participation in idol feasts which in Gentile cities were considered civic affairs. Either we are to understand Acts 15 in this way or else this prohibition *was* a compromise to Jewish scruples and capable of modification by Paul as he wrote to the Corinthians.[13]

The abstaining from "blood, and from things strangled" can be lumped together. One common Gentile practice was to drink blood mingled with wine, and another was to strangle an animal so that the blood would be retained in the meat. Both practices conflict with the OT prohibitions against the eating of blood.[14] It is not clear whether this commandment is provisional or still binding. We may observe, however, its high importance in the OT, nothing seeming to set it aside in the NT (in fact, being here enjoined), and that it was considered binding by early Christians up until at least A.D. 177.[15]

The last provision prohibiting unchastity is both an OT and NT principle. The Gentiles, especially the Greeks, were noted for their loose morality. Paul's description of Gentile immorality only scratches the surface of the real condition.[16] It was widely believed among Greeks that homosexual love was purer than natural love.[17] We sympathize not only with Jewish concern here, but with the whole Biblical concern for a high sexual morality.

While the particular situations which occasioned this "apostolic letter" also occasioned the particular provisions of the letter and would seem to limit them to that situation of the church, it is also true that these prohibitions have a certain relevance to us today. *All* Biblical prohibitions were spoken to people at a given historic

---

[10]Acts 16:3; 21:26; 1 Cor. 9:19ff.
[11]Cf. Rom. 14:1-23; 1 Cor. 10:23-31, etc.
[12]1 Cor. 10:28-29.
[13]*Ibid.*
[14]See Lev. 3:17; 7:26; 17:10-15; Deut. 12:16, 23; and 1 Sam. 14:33.
[15]Eusebius, *H.E.*, V:1:26.
[16]Rom. 1:18ff (particularly vss. 24-27).
[17]See Plato's *Symposium* as one example.

point. Any Biblical command becomes relevant to us when it can be shown in some way that our situation parallels that of the recipient of the original message. Although we are not troubled by the "idol" problem today, there are many situations where the spirit of this prohibition would apply—especially in light of Rom. 14:1ff. 1 Cor. 8:7, and 10:28, 29. The blood prohibition should probably be heeded today in view of the OT precedent, this NT provision, and no clear indication that it was rescinded. The chastity commandment, of course, is universal in the Bible. Although these provisions certainly had an immediate and particular audience, probably each of the four items would find either a specific or a "spiritual principle" application even today.

LAYING ON OF HANDS IN ACTS 6:6 AND 13:3

Everett Ferguson

The narratives of the appointment of the Seven and the sending out of Paul and Barnabas echo the accounts of the appointment of Joshua (Num. 27) and the consecration of the Levites (Num. 8)—the two Old Testament stories in which the laying on of hands is used in setting apart men to God's service.

Acts 6:1-6 shows the following verbal parallels to the Septuagint version of Numbers 27:15-23: (1) Acts 6:3—the people are commanded to *episkepsasthe* ("look about for," a relatively rare meaning) seven men; Num. 27:16—Moses asks God to *episkepsastho* ("look about for") a man to lead the people. (2) Acts 6:3—the men are to be "full of the Spirit and of wisdom"; Num. 27:18—Joshua is a man "in whom there is spirit," which is termed in Deut. 34:9 the "spirit of wisdom." (3) Acts 6:3—the appointment is *epi tes chreias tautes* ("over this duty"); Num. 27:16—the appointment is *epi tes sunagoges tautes* ("over this assembly"). (4) Acts 6:6—the selected men are *estesan* ("made to stand") *enopion* ("before," a common word in Luke) the apopstles; Num. 27:19—Joshua *steseis enanti* ("shall stand before"; *estesen enantion* in v. 22) the people. (5) Acts 6:6—they *epethekan autois tas cheiras* ("laid their hands on them"); Num. 27:18, 23—Moses *epetheken tas cheiras autou ep' auton* ("laid his hands upon him").

The similarities and differences are interwoven in their significance. The same basic sequence is observable: there is a command to select someone meeting definite qualifications to be appointed over a responsibility, who is publicly presented and then receives the laying on of hands. But the roles are in a measure reversed. The role of the people of Israel is taken by the apostles, and the role of God and Moses is taken by the people of Christ. The people in Acts 6, instead of God and his leadership, select the functionaries who possess the Spirit and lay on hands. Although Codex D gives a reading

at verse 6 which has the apostles do the laying on of hands, the best attested text is ambiguous. Unless there is a change of subject in the middle of the sentence (as there is in v. 5), the people do the laying on of hands. The parallel to Num. 27 strongly suggests that the apostles did not lay on hands, for the role of the apostles is that of the people in Num. 27, namely the witnesses to a public commissioning before whom the appointees are formally presented ("made to stand") for recognition. Note that in Acts 6 the appointment is over an activity and not over a people.

The verbal echoes indicate that Luke was deliberately alluding to the Old Testament episode. The linking of this first step in organization with the first transmission of authority in Israel (an event which also served as the pattern for Rabbinic ordination) was a bold claim that Christians were living in a new age of revelation and were the true heirs of the traditions of the Old Testament. To this doctrinal significance should be added the organizationally significant implication that the new people of God act in the place of God in the appointment of their functionaries.

Numbers 8:5-22 also presents a parallel: the people were assembled together (*sunaxeis*, with which compare the calling together of the disciples, *proskalesamenoi*, in Acts 6:2); the Levites were "presented" (*prosaxeis*) before the Lord; and the people of Israel laid their hands on the Levites (Num. 8:9, 10). However, the events of Numbers 8 seem chiefly to be alluded to in Acts 13. In addition to the occurrence once more of the laying on of hands, the following contacts may be observed: (1) Acts 13:2; Num. 8:5—the choice in each instance is divinely made. (2) Acts 13:2—Paul and Barnabas are chosen for *to ergon ho proskeklemai* ("the work to which I have called them"); Num. 8:11—the Levites are to *ergazesthai ta erga kuriou* ("work the works of the Lord," "of Israel" in v. 19). (2) Acts 13:2—the Spirit makes his will known during a divine service (*leitourgounton*); Num. 8:22—the Levites after their consecration perform divine service (*leitourgein ten leitourgian*), and note that Paul considered himself to be a *leitourgos* in preaching the Gospel to Gentiles (Rom. 15:16). (4) Acts 13:2—the church is commanded to *aphorisate* ("separate") Paul and Barnabas; in the LXX of Num. 8:11 the same root is used for the Hebrew "wave offering," as is done commonly in the LXX (cf. further v. 14, where the LXX uses *diasteleis* in order to translate the Hebrew from the root *badal* which is sometimes rendered in the LXX by *aphorizo*.

On first thought one would expect the pairing of the Levites with the Seven and Joshua with the missionaries. Indeed if the Seven were the first representatives of a diaconate patterned on the Levites and if Paul and Barnabas received episcopal ordination patterned after Rabbinic ordination, then this should have been the pairing. But if the fundamental theological and constitutional implications are as we have suggested, then Luke's pairing is not only appropriate but gives a valuable insight.

The Old Testament allusions indicate that the laying on of hands involved (1) a commissioning and authorization (Num. 27) and (2) a ratification of a choice and creation of representatives who were offered to the Lord for service (Num. 8). These meanings may be regarded as amplifications (present in varying degrees in "ordination" contexts) of the basal New Testament significance of the laying on of hands—the conferring of a blessing or a benediction (Mark 10:16; cf. Luke 24:50).[1] The statements of Acts 6:6 and 13:3 carry the discussion further by specifying that prayer (strengthened in urgency by fasting in the latter instance) was made while hands were being imposed. The expression of human approval is absorbed by the larger idea of the petition for divine favor.

There is no indication that any sacramental power, or more particularly the Holy Spirit, was conferred by the laying on of hands in these passages. Although Paul uses *aphorizo* in speaking of his apostleship (Rom. 1:1; Gal. 1:15), he makes clear that his apostleship in the larger sense dates from his conversion (cf. Gal. 1:1; Acts 26:16-18). Although Acts 6 was taken by the later church as the beginning of the diaconate, no special gift seems to have been bestowed. There was nothing more that the comunity in either case could give than its own blessing (by commissioning or by ratification) and prayer to God. But to say this, when the community functions as the means of the divine choice or in accord with a divine choice, is not to disparage the act but rather to enhance the community which acts.

Havertown, Pa.

"ALMOST PERSUADED" NOW TO BELIEVE?—Acts 26:28

Pat Harrell

Few people in the history of religious literature present more of an enigma than Herod Agrippa II, heir of Herod's domain and name but not his greatness. If it were only a queqstion of historical evaluation there would be no problem. He was no more than a petty levantine king under the shadow of the Roman eagle. His predicament is the result, not of his years upon the throne, but of a few moments during which he occupied the judgment seat before which stood a shackled prisoner named Paul of Tarsus.

The Background

The scene is easily reconstructed from Luke's account in chapters 25 and 26 of the Acts of the Apostles. In the year 59 the Romans replaced Felix as procurator of Judea with Porcius Festus. As a novice administrator of a people who continually kicked against the

[1]Compare the extensive study by the writer of "Ordination in the Ancient Church," of which the first part has already appeared in this Quarterly.

Roman goad, Festus was anxious at the beginning to win popular Jewish support. Such an opportunity presented itself at his first visit to Jerusalem when the religious leaders requested that he transfer Paul, who had already languished two years in prison in Caesarea, to the Holy City. Festus, being unfamiliar with the circumstance concerning the apostle and now only three days in his office of procurator, suggested that the leaders accompany him back to Caesarea to discuss the case. When in the preliminary hearing Festus expressed a willingneses to try Paul officially in Jerusalem, Paul made his appeal, as a Roman citizen, to be tried in Rome by the Emperor. The attempt to compromise was thus thwarted and Festus could not be blamed by the Jews, but Paul created for the governor a problem with his superiors. Before Festus could send Paul to Rome there had to be a specific charge against him, something that was lacking despite all the Jewish opposition. But by the kind of coincidence from which history is woven, it happened that Herod Agrippa and his sister-wife, Bernice, were in Caesarea making a state call to the newly appointed procurator. Upon learning the details concerning Paul, Agrippa expressed a desire to hear the apostle and Festus promptly arranged the meeting for the morrow. In his apology before Festus, the Herodians, and the dignitaries of Caesarea, Paul rehearsed his life in relation to Christianity as he was transformed from persecutor to persecuted. To this the audience listened politely and perhaps patiently until Paul mentioned the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead. At this point Festus, who would be unsympathetic to these Jewish concepts, could contain himself no longer, crying out, "Paul . . . you are mad" (for a similar response cf. Paul in Athens, Acts 17). In reply to this accusation, Paul appealed to Agrippa's personal knowledge of Christianitiy and directly asked him, "King Agrippa, do you believe the prophets? I know you believe." To this the King responded, "In a short time you think to make me a Christian!" (RSV 26:26).

The Problem

Simply stated the problem concerning Agrippa is: was he in his reply sincere or sarcastic? The Greek text *en oligo me peitheis Christianon poiesai* (literally: "In brief you are persuading me to act the Christian") can be read either way. That it is possible to interpret it as a sincere statement from Agrippa is no reason to take it as such—duality of understanding is an essential characteristic of sarcasm. This duality is seen in both translators and commentators. Wiclif's rendering of 1380 ("in litil thing thou counceilist me to be made a cristen man") appears to take it as sarcasm. Tyndale (1534) followed by Cranmer (1539) have the opposite reading. It is the Geneva translation (1557) that first introduces "almost thou persuadest me" and this phrase is then reflected in the Rheims (1582) and King James (1611) versions. The American Standard, the Revised Standard and most modern speech translations view the

passage as a sarcastic expression. The same difference of opinion can be observed among the commentators. Chrysostom, Luther, and Beza thought Agrippa was nearly converted. More recent works, as in the case of translations, interpret it as sarcasm. Among the group is Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity,* Bruce in his commentaries on both the Greek and English texts, and the volume on Acts in the Moffatt, Tyndale, Layman's and Interpreters series. With this position McGarvey agrees while Johnson advocates the opposite.

The Approach

Obviously the problem is one that cannot be solved entirely on the basis of philology. Written words at the best are but lifeless symbols which depend upon the reader to breathe into them again the breath of life. The reader thus has a great responsibility to see that the renewal of life is not merely a transmigration of his own spirit, but a genuine resurrection of reality. The ultimate conclusion concerning Agrippa, therefore, rests with the dramatist rather than the linguist. In recreating the scene, these factors cannot be overlooked.

(a) Agrippa was a puppet king of Rome who well knew that the crown rested uneasily upon his head. Should the imperial government decree he would lose both the crown and his head as well.

(b) Although Festus had been in office only a few days, Agrippa had already presented himself to the procurator in a state call. It would be such officials as Festus who would decide in time of difficulty with Rome the competence of Agrippa as king.

(c) Paul chose to make his defense on religious grounds. The conclusion of Festus, having heard Paul's apology, was that he must be mad.

(d) Paul's direct appeal to Agrippa had the effect of suddenly placing the king on trial before a Roman procurator who had already dismissed the apostle's belief as madness.

To believe that Agrippa was receptive to Paul's message is impossible in the living context of the event and is out of character with what is known about the king from history. It is far easier to be, not almost but altogether persuaded that Agrippa meant, "Surely you do not thinik, Paul, that by this speech, you can convert me in the presence of a Roman official who thinks you to be mad."

Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

NOTES ON SOME SELECTED PASSAGES IN ACTS INVOLVING LUKE'S USE OF THE OPTATIVE MOOD

J. W. Roberts

The optative mood was in its death throes in the Greek of the New Testament period. An unsuccessful attempt by the Atticists to revive its use probably helped keep a memory of its former glory alive longer than it would have lived otherwise, but it was doomed for disuse. The difference in its frequency of use in a writer like Xenophon (fl. B.C. 375) and a writer like Paul in the New Testament is the most striking single difference in the two bodies of Greek writings.

It is only natural that the mood should be infrequent in the New Testament. There are only 67 optative uses in the N. T. Of these, the stereotyped "God forbid" (*me genoito*) accounts for 14 in Paul. Of the remaining 53 Luke has 27. Of the non-Lukan uses all are uses of its simplest and most direct use—the expression of wishes, the use from which the mood gets its name—with the exception of four uses of *ei* and the optative in the protasis of incomplete conditional sentences (1 Cor. 14:10; 15:37; 1 Peter 3:14, 17). Luke is the only N. T. writer who uses the optative in indirect discourse or in a potential sense. He is thus the only writer to use the mood where it has a really stylistic or literary flavor, as Moulton observes.[1]

Of Luke's uses 16 are in Acts. Some of these are interesting as influencing definitely the shade of thought which Luke expressed. Too, they are worth noting together because some recent commentators have had slightly different understanding of the significance in the mood of them.

Luke's uses may be divided into five groups: (1) the Optative of Wish: Luke 1:38; 20:16; Acts 8:20. (2) *ei* with the optative in conditional or quasi-conditional sentences: Acts 17:11, 27 *bis;* 20: 16; 24:19; 25:20; 27:12, 39. (3) With *prin e* "before": Acts 25:16. (4) The optative with *an* (potential): Luke 1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Acts 5:24; 8:31; 10:17; 17:18; 26:29. (5) The optative without *an* in indirect questions: Luke 1:29; 3:15; 8:9; 18:36 (lacking in B aleph and koine); 22:23; Acts 21:33.

Notice here will be taken only of those paspsages from Acts.

Acts 5:24. "The chief priests were much perplexed about them, wondering what this would come to" (*ti an genoito touto*) (RSV). Page thinks that this represents a direct question *ti genesetai touto*:

[1]Moulton, James Hope, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek,* Vol. I, Prolegomena, Third Edition (Edinburgh, Clark, 1908), p. 197. The other references in this note will not be documented since they are to well-known works. Most of them are referred to elsewhere in this issue.

"What will be the end?" Literally, "What will this become?" But this does not account for the *an*, the particle which usually accompanies the potential meaning. Lenski thinks the question was "what might have occurred," the astonishment was how in the world such a thing could have happened. This writer thinks the most likely idea is, (sc. "If this thing should be allowed to continue,) What would this become?" Moffatt has "at a loss to know what to make of it."

Acts 8:20. "Your silver perish with you" (*To argurion sou sun soi ie eis apoleian*). *eie* here is an optative of wish of verb "to be" used in a pregnant construction with *eis* (Page), something like "go to destruction and stay there." Bruce paraphrases, "Perdition take your silver, as it will you too unless you repent and seek forgiveness for your wicked thought." William's "To hell with you and your money" seems strange on our ears.

Acts 8:31. "How can I (*pos an dunaimen*), unless some one guides me?" This is a mixed conditional sentence, the if clause of a future-more-probable sentence put last and the conclusion is the potential optative which serves as the apodosis of the future-less-probable condition. Page paraphrases: "You need not ask (if I can understand what I read), for how should I be able, except some one guide." "The sentence in its first half expresses helplessness, a gleam of hope and possibility comes with *except*."

Acts 10:17. Peter was inwardly perplexed as to *what* the vision which he had seen *might mean* (*ti an eie*, lit. what it might *be*). This is the potential optative in a question. The presence of the *an* adds more doubt than if it were merely *ti eie* "what it was." "If he could penetrate its mystery, what would he find it to mean."

Acts 17:11. The Beroeans "examined the scriptures daily to see if these things were so (*ei choi tauta houtos*)." As it stands and as it is usually interpreted as the protasis of the future-less-probable condition, remoteness of possibility would be the idea. This does not exactly fit the context. Robertson first takes the words as representing the indicative of corresponding direct question, "Are these things so?" In which cas *ei* means "whether" and is not conditional. Robertson then says that it may be taken as the protasis of the ideal or future-less-probable condition. Lenski thinks that it represents the logical condition (assumed as true) in indirect discourse, which would certainly fits the context and the interpretation ordinarily put on it better. If not conditional, it represents a direct interrogative question and shows that the people were open-minded on the question.

Acts 17:18. "What would this babbler wish to say" (*ti an theloi legein*)? Again we have the potential expression in a question. "What would he wish to say, if he could speak to us?" The intimation is that there "is a possibility, but only a possibility" that there would be meaning to what Paul would have said.

Acrs 17:27. "that they should seek God, in the hope that they might feel after him and find him (*ei pselapheseian auton kai heuroien*)." Robertson again takes this passage as an ideal condition expressing uncertainty of its attainment. Rackham says it expresses "dubious hope." Burton and Lenski think rather that it is *ean* with the subjunctive incorporated into a sentence in indirect discourse dependent on a verb of past time and consequently changed to *ei* with the optative. There is also the possibility that the verbs should be thought of as having the force of indirect questions since "an omitted apodosis is sometimes virtually contained in the protasis, and the latter expresses a possibility which is an object of hope or desire." At any rate, it seems unlikely that Paul is expressing doubt or uncertainty that man can find God.

Acts 20:16. "He was hastening to be at Jerusalem, if possible (*ei dunaton eie*), on the day of Pentecost." The optative here is due to *ean* and the subjunctive in a future-more-probable condition being put in indirect discourse. Hope and not doubt that he would be able to make it is the implication of the condition.

Acts 21:33. "He inquired who he was and what he had done (*tis eie kai ti estin pepoiekos*)." The first verb in this indirect question is optative, the other indicative. Page thinks the change in construction is for variety. The perfect optative in the second clause would be "ugly" Greek. As it stands there is a distinction which most editors would draw: "He was uncertain who he was, but assumes as certain that he is a malefactor."

Acts 24:19. "They ought to be here . . . and make accusation, if they have anything against me" (*ei ti exhoien pros eme*)." Here a condition of the first class (assumed as true for the sake of argument) has been put in the optative in indirect discourse. The original statement was, "if (as they claim) they have something against me."

Acts 25:16. The two verbs after "before" (*prin e*), "had" opportunity and "laid" against him, are optative, but without special meaning for the context. They are optative because the sentence is in indirect discourse. The direct speech for the first time would be *prin e exhe* (subj.).

Acts 25:20. "I asked whether he wished to go to Jerusalem (*elegon ei bouloitio*). Here again the optative is not due to a doubt expressed or implied but due to the fact that the direct question "dost thou wish" is expressed indirectly, "I asked whether (*ei*) he wished."

Acts 26:29. "I would to God that . . . you were . . . such as I am" (*euxaimen an*). Here we have the potential optative in direct discourse and without a question. Paul seems to regard the situation as somewhat hopeless, "I would to God (sc., e.g., if it would do any good) . . ." This probably has bearing on the question whether Agrippa spoke sincerely or not.

Acts 27:12. "The majority advised to put to sea from there, on the chance that somehow they could (*eipos dunaivto*) reach Phoenix . . . and winter there." Robertson thinks that here there is a condition of potentiality and that it expresses purpose. Lenski takes issue again. He thinks the optative is due to indirect question and says that Robertson contradicts himself by saying in another place, "Here after primary tenses we should have *ean* and the subjunctive or the future indicative." Nor does Lenski think that the clause expresses purpose. "They said, 'If we may somehow we able to winter'." Burton and Page agree that the original thought is that of an *ean* and the subjunctive, expressing the fervent hope and expectation.

Acts 27:39. "They noticed a bay with a beach, on which they planned if possible (*ei dunainto*, lit. if they should be able) to bring the ship ashore." Here most of the grammarians think that the optative with *ei* is indirect discourse after the past indicative verb. The original statement probably was "Let us bring the ship ashore on the beach in that bay, if we are (will be) able" using *ean* and the subj.).

One can certainly say that Luke adds touches of vividness in some places by his use of the opptative and in others shows that he could use the earlier idiom with exactness.

MISCELLANY . . .

In previous issues of the *Restoration Quarterly* a number of articles which concern the Book of Acts of Apostles have been published. Some of these might well be listed here for reference.

Baptism for Remission of Sins. An article on this subject by the editor was printed in Vol. 1, No. 4. Readers of this special who may expect a note on the design of baptism as involved in such passages as Acts 2:28 or 22:16 will find this matter discussed at length in this article.

Christology in Luke-Acts. In this special on Acts no discussion of the usual problem of the belief of the early church about the person and work of Christ is included. The reason is that this subject has been recently covered in the article "Christology in Luke-Acts" by Abraham J. Malherbe (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 62ff, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 115ff).

Relation of Acts 11 or 15 to Galatians 2. The problem involved in the discussion of the chronology of Acts from the viewpoint of Paul's visits to Jerusalem was discussed somewhat extensively by Jay Smith in his article "The Date of Galatians" (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 52ff) with an opposing point of view set forth by Bill Decker in an article "The Early Date of Galatians" (Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 132ff). Since this problem was thus discussed, we have included no further note on it in this issue.

Book Reviews. The following books touching on the Book of Acts have been reviewed in the *Restoration Quarterly*: Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (Roy B. Ward, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 94), Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* and *Acts of Apostles* (Frank Pack, Vol. 1, No. 3, 143f), Stonehouse, *Paul before the Areopagus* (the editor, Vol. 2, No. 9, p. 93), Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte,* Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles,* and Carter and Earle, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Abe J. Malherbe, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 51ff).

The Book of Acts has special meaning to the student of the Restoration Movement as well as to the students and preachers who believe in the Bible as a basis of a restoration of New Testament Christianity. Previous to the early preaching of the Campbells and their associates frontier preaching in America had paid little attention to the division of the covenants as taught by Paul and the centrality of Acts of Apostles as setting forth the beginning of the church and giving us a model for conversion to the church was little appreciated. But these points of view were to be central to the preaching of the Restoration Movement. See as a sample the sermon "Acts of Apostles" in *Sweeney's Sermons* by John S. Sweeny (Nashville, Gospel Advocate Co., 1897). Though comparatively little commentary material has appeared by our brotherhood on this book, it has figured prominently in our thinking and preaching.

If this effort makes even a small contribution to the understanding of the book and some of the problems connected with its study, those who have worked on it will feel repaid.

RESTORATION QUARTERLY

Index — Volume 4, 1960

Compiled by Callie Faye Milliken

"Added to the Church"—Acts 2:47. J. D. Thomas. 238.

"Almost persuaded" now to believe?—Acts 26:28. Pat Harrell. 252.

"Apostles"—Acts 14:14. William M. Green. 245.

AUTHORITY (RELIGION). The English Puritan struggle and the question of Biblical authority. Earl Irwin West. 35.

Bales, James D. The Communist doctrine of morality. 89.

BALES, JAMES D. Personalia. 71.

BAPTISM. The relation of baptism to justification by faith only in Luther's teaching. Thomas N. Schulz. 94.

BAPTISM OF INFANTS. Martin Luther on infant baptism (quotation). 147.

Bell, R. C. Christ's kingdom advancing—Acts 13-14. 241.

BIBLE. MANUSCRIPTS. A study of Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}). Frank Pack. 1, 61.

BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT. ACTS.

"Added to the Church"—Acts 2:47. J. D. Thomas. 238.

"Almost persuaded" now to believe?—Acts 26:28. Pat Harrell. 252.

Christ's kingdom advancing—Acts 13-14. R. C. Bell. 241.

"The gift of the Holy Spirit"—Acts 2:38. R. L. Roberts, Jr. 234.

Laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3. Everett Ferguson. 250.

The necessary things—Acts 15:28-29. Jay Smith. 247.

Roman citizenship and its bearing on the Book of Acts. Eugene Brewer. 205.

The speeches of Acts in recent study. Roy Bowen Ward. 190.

The study of Acts of the Apostles yesterday and today. J. W. Roberts. 173.

The "western" text of Acts. Frank Pack. 220.

BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT. CORINTHIANS. Equality in giving (2 Cor. 8:13). David Lipscomb. 104.

BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT. JOHN. Textual authority for John 7:53-8:11. Fausto Salvoni. 11.

BOOK REVIEWS

Amstutz, H. Clair. *Growing Up To Love.* (Abraham J. Malserbe) 57.

Barclay, William. *The Master's Men.* 169.

Beck, William. *The Christ of the Gospels.* 165.

Berkouwer, G. C. *Divine Election.* 168.

Berkouwer, G. C. *The Triumph of Grace in the hTeology of Karl Barth.* 168.

Blackwood, Andrew W., Jr. *Devotional Introduction to Job.* 116.

Blaiklock, E. M. *Faith is the Victory.* 165.

Boaman, Don Earl. *Helps From Hebrews.* 167.

Bowman, Henry A. *A Christian Interpretation of Marriage.* (Russell Jay Carver) 56.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel.* (Harold O. Forshey) 158.

Bromily, G. W. *The Unity and Disunity of the Church.* 170.

Bruce, F. F. *Bible Exegesis in the Qumran Texts.* 166.

Bunyan, John. *Pilgrim's Progress* (new abridgement). 114.

Calvin, John. *Commentaries* (Library of Christian Classics). 57.

Caper, W. Melville. *Toward Christian Marriage.* (Abraham J. Malherbe) 57.

Carnell, Edward John. *The Case for Orthodox Theology.* (Don McGaughey) 106.

Carter, Charles W. *The Acts of the Apostles.* (Abraham J. Malherbe) 51.

Chappell, Clovis G. *Sermons of Simon Peter.* 170.

Cullman, Oscar. *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead.* (Brown Kinnard, Jr.) 160.

Cullman, Oscar. *A Message to Catholics and Protestants.* 171.

DeBlank, Joost. *A Working Faith.* 169.

DeWolf, L. Harold. *The Case for Theology in Liberal Perspective.* (Don McGaughey) 106.

Ernsberger, David J. *A Philosophy of Adult Christian Education.* 172.

Fagley, Richard M. *The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility.* 169.

Good, Edwin M. *You Shall Be My People.* 171.

Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* (Abraham J. Malherbe) 51.

Hall, Colby E. *The New Light Christians.* (Thomas H. Olbricht) 50.

Hall, S. H. *Three Defenses of Music in Worship pAnswered.* 170.

Hendriksen, William. *The Bible on the Life Hereafter.* 164.

Hershbereger, Guy Franklin. *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations.* 58.

Hooton, Caradine. *What Shall We Say About Alcohol?* 116.

Hordern, William. *The Case for a New Reformation Theology.* (Don McGaughey) 106.

Hughes, Ray H. *Sunday School Worker's Training Course, Vol. 1-4.* 172.

Jones, Ilion T. *A Protestant Speaks His Mind.* 171.

Kee, Howard Clark. *Jesus and God's New People.* 165.

Kroner, Richard. *Speculation and Revelation in the Age of Christian Philosophy.* (Ralph V. Graham) 162.

Laymon, Charles M. *Christ in the New Testament.* 58.

Maury, Pierre. *Predestination and Other Papers.* 168.

Merchant, Jane. *In Green Pastures.* 114.

Mixter, Russell L., ed. *Evolution and Christian Thought Today.* (J. D. Thomas) 112.

Mouser, Harold E. *The Cross-Reference Bible.* 167.

Morgan, G. Campbell. *An Exposition of the Whole Bible.* 57.
Morgan, G. Campbell. *The Minor Prophets, the Men and Their Messages.* 116.
Mounce, Robert H. *The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching.* 166.
Mudge, Lewis S. *In His Service.* 170.
Person, Peter. *The Minister in Christian Education.* 172.
Radcliffe, Lynn J. *With Christ in the Garden.* 114.
Richardson, Alan. *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (Abraham J. Malherbe) 54.
Rowe, Lois. *On Call.* 114.
Schnell, William J. *Into the Light of Christianity.* 164.
Schnell, William J. *Thirty Years a Watch Tower Slave.* 164.
Schroeder, Ruth. *Youth Programs on Nature Themes.* 115.
Szikzai, Stephen. *The Story of Israel: From Joshua to Alexander the Great.* 171.
Tasker, R. V. G. *The Gospel According to John, Tyndale Bible Commentaries.* 115.
Thielicke, Helmut. *Between God and Satan.* 170.
Thiessen, John Caldwell. *A Survey of World Missions.* 58.
Thomas, G. Ernest. *Daily Meditations on the Seven Last Words.* 114.
Thompson, J. A. *Archeology and the New Testament.* 165.
Thomson, James G. S. S. *The Praying Christ.* 170.
Throckmorton, Burton H. *The New Testament and Mythology.* 166.
Toombs, Lawrence E. *The Threshold of Christianity.* 171.
Torrance, Thomas F. *The Apocalypsee Today.* 115.
Torrance, T .F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers.* 167.
Torrey, R. A. *You and Your Bible.* 57.
Van Der Meer, F. *Atlas of the Early Christian World.* (Everett Ferguson) 110.
Von Allmen, J. J. *A Companion to the Bible.* 167.
Walker, Williston. *History of the Christian Church.* (Thomas H. Olbricht) 49.9
White, R. E. O. *Beneath the Cross of Jesus.* 170.
Whiting, Thomas A. *Sermons on the Prodigal Son.* 169.
Wicke, Lloyd C. *God In My Life.* 115.
Williams, C. S. C. *The Acts of the Apostles.* (Abraham J. Malherbe) 51.
Zeigler, Earl F. *Christian Education of Adults.* 58.

Brewer, Eugene. Roman citizenship and its bearing on the Book of Acts. 205.

Carver, Russel Jay. Review of Bowman: *A Christian Interpretation of Marriage.* 58.

Christ's kingdom advancing—Acts 13-14 (Notes on selected papssages). R. C. Bell. 241.

CITIZENSHIP. ROMAN. Roman citizenship and its bearing on the Book of Acts. Eugene Brewer. 205.

The Communist doctrine of morality. James D. Bales. 89.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS. John the Baptist and the Dead Sea Scrolls. John McRay. 80.

ENGLAND. CHURCH HISTORY. The English Puritan struggle and the question of Biblican authority. Earl Irvin West. 35.

Equality in giving (2 Cor. 8:13). Reprint from Gospel Advocate. David Lipscomb. 104.

The English Puritan struggle and the question of Biblical authority. Earl Irvin West. 35.

Exegetical helps . . . Contrary-to-fact conditions. J. W. Roberts. 149.

Exegetical helps . . . Some notes on swearing. J. W. Roberts. 30.

FAITH (VERSUS WORKS). The relation of baptism to justification by faith only in Luther's teaching. Thomas N. Schulz. 94.

Ferguson, Everett

Laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3. 250.

Ordination in the ancient church (1). 117.

Review of Van Der Meer: *Atlas of the Early Christian World.* 110.

Forshey, Harold. Review of Bright: *A History of Israel.* 158.

"The gift of the Holy Spirit"—Acts 2:38. R. L. Roberts, Jr. 234.

GIVING. Equality in giving (2 Cor. 8:13). Reprint from Gospel Advocate. David Lipscomb. 104.

Gnosis and primitive Christianity: a survey (II). Abraham J. Malherbe. 16.

Graham, Ralph V. Review of Kroner: *Speculation and Revelation in the Age of Christian Philosophy.* 162.

GREEK LANGUAGE. HELLENISTIC N. T. Some aspects of conditional sentences in the Greek New Testament. J. W. Roberts. 72.

Green, William M. "Apostles"—Acts 14:14. William M. Green. 245.

HAGGARD, RICE. Some material on Rice Haggard. 153.

HARDING, JAMES A. (Thesis by Kenneth Greene at Abiliene Christian College) 153.

Harrell, Pat. "Almost persuaded" now to believe?—Acts 26:28. 252.

Herald of Gospel Liberty and the Life, Conversion, Preaching and Suffering of Elias Smith now on film. 152.

HEROD. AGRIPPA II. "Almost persuaded" now to believe—Acts 26:28. Everett Ferguson. 252.

HOLY SPIRIT. "The gift of the Holy Spirit"—Acts 2:38. R. L. Roberts, Jr. 234.

JERUSALEM COUNCIL. The necessary things—Acts 15:28-29. Jay Smith. 247.

John the Baptist and the Dead Sea Scrolls. John McRay. 80.

Kinnard, Brown, Jr. Review of Cullman: *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead.* 160.

Laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3. Everett Ferguson. 250.

Lewis, Jack P. The synagogue. 199.

Martin Luther on infant baptism. (quotation) 147.

Lipscomb, David. Equality in giving (2 Cor. 8:13). Reprint from Gospel Advocate. 104.

LUKE. The speeches of Acts in recent study. Roy Bowen Ward. 190.

LUTHER, MARTIN.

Martin Luther on infant baptism. (quotation) 147.

The relation of baptism to justification by faith only in Luther's teaching. Thomas N. Schulz. 94.

McGARVEY, J. W. Other source material on interest (report on the publishing of his autobiography) 152.

McGARVEY, J. W., AWARD. The J. W. McGarvey award. 70.

McGaughey, Don.

Review of Carnell: *The Case for Orthdox Theology.* 106.

Reiew of DeWolf: *The Case for Theology in Liberal Perspective.* 106.

Review of Hordern: *The Case for a New Reformation Theology.* 106.

McGAUGHEY, DON. The J. W. McGarvey award. 70.

McRay, John. John the Baptist and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 80.

McRAY, JOHN.

The J. W. McGarvey award. 70.

Personalia. 71.

Malherbe, Abraham J.

Gnosis and primitive Christianity: a survey (II). 16.

Review of Amstutz: *Growing Up To Love.* 57.

Review of Caper: *Toward Christian Marirage.* 57.

Review of Carter: *The Acts of the Apostles.* 51.

Review of Hoenchen: *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 51.

Review of Richardson: *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament.* 54.

Review of Williams: *The Acts of the Apostles.* 51.

MALHERBE, ABRAHAM J. Executive secretary receives scholarship for study in Holland. 71.1

MARCION OF SINOPE. Gnosis an dprimitive Christianity: a survey (II). Abraham J. Malherbe. 16.

MANUSCRIPTS, COPTIC (PAPYRI). Gnosis and primitive Christianity: a survey (II). Abraham J. Malherbe. 16.

The necessary things—Acts 15:28-29. Jay Smith. 247.

Notes on selected passages:
"Added to the church"—Acts 2:47. J. D. Thomas. 238.
"Apostles"—Acts 14:14. William M. Green. 245.
Christ's kingdom advancing—Acts 13-14. R. C. Bell. 241.
"The gift of the Holy Spirit"—Acts 2:38. R. L. Roberts, Jr. 235.
The necessary things—Acts 15:28-29. Jay Smith. 247.
Laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3. Everett Ferguson. 250.
"Almost persuaded now to believe"?—Acts 26:28. Pat Harrell. 252.
Passages involving Luke's use of the optative mood. J. W. Roberts. 255.

OATHS. Exegetical helps: Some notes on swearing. J. W. Roberts. 30.

Olbright, Thomas H.
Review of Hall: *The New Light Christians.* 50.
Review of Walker: *History of the Christian Church.* 49.

OLBRICHT, THOMAS. Personalia. 34.

Ordination in the ancient church (1). Everett Ferguson. 117.

Origen's evaluation of textual variants in the Greek Bible. Frank Pack. 139.

Pack, Frank.
Origen's evaluation of textual variants in the Greek Bible. 139.
A study of papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}) 1, 61.
The "westeren" text of Acts. 220.

PACK, FRANK. Personalia. 34, 71.

PAUL. SERMONS.
Christ's kingdom advancing—Acts 13-14. R. C. Bell. 241.
The speeches of Acts in recent study. Roy Bowen Ward. 190.

PURITANS. The English Puritan struglge and the question of Biblical authority. Earl Irvin West. 35.

The relation of baptism to justification by faith only in Luther's teaching. Thomas N. Schulz. 94.

Roberts, J. W.
Exegetical helps . . . Contrary-to-fact conditions. 149.
Exegetical helps . . . Some notes on swearing. 30.
Some aspects of conditional sentences in the Greek New Testament. 72.
Notes on some selected passages in Acts involving Luke's use of the optative mood. 255.

Roberts, R. L., Jr.
"The gift of the Holy Spirit"—Acts 2:38. 234.

Roman citizenship and its bearing on the book of Acts. Eugene Brewer. 205.

Salvoni, Fausto. Textual authority for John 7:53-8:11. 11.

SALVONI, FAUSTO. Personalia. 34.

Schulz, Thomas N. The relation of baptism to justification by faith only in Luther's teaching. 94.

SCHULZ, THOMAS N. Personalia. 71.

SIMON MAGUS. Gnosis and primitive Christianity: a survey (II). Abraham J. Malherbe. 16.

SMITH, ELIAS. *The Herald of Gospel Liberty and The Life, Conversion, Preaching and Suffering of Elias Smith* now on film. 152.

Smith, Jay. The necessary things—Acts 15:28-29. 247.

Some aspects of conditional sentences in the Greek New Testament. J. W. Roberts. 72.

The speeches of Acts in recent study. Roy Bowen Ward. 190.

The study of Acts of the Apostles yesterday and today. J. W. Roberts. 173.

A study of Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}). Frank Pack. 1, 61.

SWEARING. Exegetical helps: Some notes on swearing. J. W. Roberts. 30.

The synagogue. Jack P. Lewis. 199.

SYNAGOGUES. The Synagogue. Jack P. Lewis. 199.

Textual authority for John 7:53-8:11. Fausto Salvoni. 11.

Thomas, J. D.
"Added to the church"—Acts 2:47. 238.
Review of Mixter: *Evolution and Christian Thought Today.* 112.

VALENTINIANS. Gnosis and primitive Christianity: a survey (II). Abraham J. Malherbe. 16.

Ward, Roy Bowen. The speeches of Acts in recent study. 190.

West, Earl Irvin. The English Puritan struggle and the question of Biblical authority. 35.

WEST, EARL. Personalia. 34.

The "western" text of Acts. Frank Pack. 220.